THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

VOL. CXLIII, No. 5 NOVEMBER, 1960

CONTENTS

The Ecumenical Council and the Orthodox Churches *Bishop Hannan* 289

Theology and the Sensus Plenior *John J. O'Rourke* 301

The Lapsed Catholic *R. J. Gettelfinger* 307

St. Jerome's Attitude Toward Marriage and Women: I *Gerard J. Campbell*, S.J. 310

Shadows Cast by Future Events *Willard F. Jabusch* 321

Do We Trust Too Much to Our Parish Schools? *Edward F. Garesché*, S.J. 326

The Eucharistic Fast *Adrian Holzmeister*, O.F.M.Cap 331

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

John P. McCormick, S.S., and Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.

Funerals of Infants 343

One Server for Multiple Masses 343

Ember Day Rubric 343

The Epistle of a Missa Cantata 344

SS. Cosmas and Damian in Lent 344

(*Contents Continued on Next Page*)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.

Copyright 1960 by The Catholic University of America Press.

(Contents continued from previous page)

Premarital Instruction of a Non-Catholic 345
Determining the Sex of Offspring 345
Conditions for an Indulgence 348

BOOK REVIEWS

The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics, *by Jean Doresse* 350
The Sunday Sermons of the Great Fathers, III *edited by M. F. Toal* 351
The Meaning and Matter of History, *by Martin D'Arcy, S.J.* 352
Children's Shepherd, *by Katherine Burton* 353
Seraph Among Angels, *by Sister Mary Minima, O.Carm.* 354
The Religion of Israel, *by Albert Gélin, P.S.S.* 355
Saint Paul and His Message, *by Amédée Brunot, S.C.J.* 355
Digest of Regulations and Rubrics of Catholic Church Music, *by Robert F. Hayburn* 357

BOOKS RECEIVED 359

Reprinted by popular request—

Something for the Parents on Pupils' Home Study

by REVEREND EDWARD P. DUNNE, O.P.

This article was originally published in the November 1958 issue of *The Catholic Educational Review*

16 pages—5½ x 8½

Sample copy ..... 15¢
In lots of 25 ..... 12¢ ea.
In lots of 100 ..... 10¢ ea.

PRICES POSTPAID

THE CATHOLIC EDUCATIONAL REVIEW
The Catholic University of America Washington 17, D. C.

THE ECUMENICAL COUNCIL AND THE ORTHODOX CHURCHES

When the Holy Father electrified the world by his announcement of a Council to the Cardinals present at the Basilica of St. Paul outside the Walls on the Feast of the Conversion of St. Paul, January 25, 1959, his announcement had a significance differing with each group of hearers. The Orthodox wondered about the procedure, the Protestants wanted to know if everyone would have equal right of discussion, the Catholics simply wanted to know what an Ecumenical Council is. It is quite fitting, therefore, to suggest a few thoughts about the attitude of each, especially of the Orthodox in relation to the Catholics, as well as a few words on the agenda of the Council.

An Ecumenical Council is the assembly of Catholic bishops all over the world, at the summons of the Holy Father, to discuss a matter of faith or morals. The word "ecumenical" means "the inhabited world," therefore universal.

The first recorded General Council of the Church was held in Jerusalem about the year 52 with the Apostles present, the final decision being delivered by St. Peter. The Council is related in the *Acts of the Apostles,* Chapter XV. It was called to discuss whether the Gentile converts were to be bound to the Jewish law and the discussion was provoked by the report of St. Paul and St. Barnabas on the results of their recent missionary journey. As the *Acts* report it:

> So the Apostles and the presbyters had a meeting to look into this matter. And after a long debate, Peter got up and said to them, "Brethren, you know that in early days God made choice among us, that through my mouth the Gentiles should hear the word of the gospel and believe. And God who knows the heart, bore witness by giving them the Holy Spirit just as he did to us . . ."

Later St. James addressed the Council and after a discussion we hear the decision: "Then the apostles and the presbyters with the whole church decided to select representatives and to send them to Antioch with Paul and Barnabas. . . . They were bearers of the following letter." The letter stated:

For the Holy Spirit and we have decided that to lay no further burden upon you but this indispensable one, that you abstain from things sacrificed to idols and from blood and from what is strangled and from immorality; keep yourselves from these things and you will get on well. Farewell.

Here is the substance of every General or Ecumenical Council: a serious and vexing matter to be decided, the assembling of the chief authorities in the Church under the direction of the Vicar of Christ, the giving of a decision approved by the Vicar of Christ with the conviction that the Holy Ghost had guided and controlled it, for the acceptance of all Christians.

It might be noted that the Orthodox believe in the supremacy of the "General Council" in the definition of doctrine and that a General Council should deal only with matters of dogma, not morals. Catholics will recall that the Holy Father consults the bishops of the world, even if not convened in council, before proceeding with the definition of a doctrine; this was notably true of the last papal definitions of doctrine, concerning the Immaculate Conception in 1854, and the Assumption of the Blessed Mother in 1950.

We are concerned at present, however, with Ecumenical Councils, those which concern the whole Church and which have a representation of the whole Church. There are Councils also for only certain sections or parts of the whole Church and the Vicar of Christ does not preside at them. For example, there may be a National Council for a whole country, a Provincial Council for a Province of the Church, a Synod for a diocese. The decisions reached at these gatherings are binding upon those whom they affect, but they do not have the authority of the Holy Father unless the decisions have been specifically approved by the Holy See, as, for example, the decrees of the Second Council of Orange or the Sixteenth Council of Carthage. Their decisions are received as having the same authority as the decrees of a General Council because of this papal approval.

It must also be remembered that at times, in practically every country in Europe, there were "mixed councils" attended by the civil and ecclesiastical authorities to determine matters pertaining to the State and to the Church. The civil authority, the king, summoned these councils. Of this kind are the fourth to the seventh synods of Toledo, Spain; many synods held under Pepin in France;

and those under Charlemagne and his successors, especially the famous Synod of Mainz in 852. At one council, in 876, in the Palatium apud Ticinum, the election of Charles the Fat was approved by the bishops and princes of Italy (Hardouin, vi, 169). Sometimes there were two chambers of discussion: the chamber of nobles and the chamber of ecclesiastics which dealt with subjects pertaining to their proper sphere. The synods under Charlemagne even discussed how much property a parish church should have to support its functions.

To the Catholic the announcements by the Holy Father was a normal if rare procedure and its chief interest lay in the fact that the Holy Father was attempting a reunion by a Council, something which has not been tried on such a scale since the Council of Florence-Ferrara in 1438 (which ultimately failed). The Catholics were thrilled at the prospect of the stupendous venture but the circumstances did not surprise them: the Holy Father announced his intention privately to the Cardinals; he took the initiative, without consultation; the Vicar of Christ spoke with the confidence born of possessing the power given to St. Peter and his successors; he did not wait for a committee to advise him or to prompt his idea.

This mode of procedure, so normal to us, was not so normal or usual to the Orthodox who were one of the prime concerns of the Holy Father's thoughts. No doubt they were pleased, perhaps startled, at the news; but the schism between the Orthodox East and the Catholic Church is now over 900 years old, except for brief periods of reunion, and so there is an *"estrangement"* to use the very sympathetic phrase of Father Congar. The first decisive break was made by the Patriarch Photius of Constantinople (who died in 891). After a period of uneasy reunion, the final break came in 1054 by the efforts of Patriarch Michael Caerularius. Overtures for union were subsequently made many times and the II Council of Lyons dealt with the matter, but its efforts were not permanently successful. Later, Eugenius IV convoked a council for that express purpose, after consultation and assistance from the Emperor of the Eastern Empire, John Paleologus VIII.

Furthermore, as in the ancient past, the Holy Father agreed to the suggestion of the Emperor about the location of the Council (the Emperor wanted it near the eastern coast of Italy, preferably in the south of Italy). The large delegation of the Orthodox, numbering about 700, was led by the Emperor and his brother. When

the Holy Father learned that the Greek delegation was nearing the coast, he proceeded to Ferrara to be there to greet them. The Emperor came with the Patriarch of Constantinople and the chief ecclesiastics or their delegates of the whole Empire. The delegation included the famous Archbishop of Nicea, Bessarion, and Isidore of Kiev. The solemn sessions were held in the cathedral of Ferrara with the Holy Father presiding. On the Gospel side of the altar was erected the empty throne of the Western Emperor and on the Epistle side was the throne of the Eastern emperor. The Western emperor was recently deceased and his successor had not yet been crowned. The Emperor not only took an active part in influencing the Greek bishops but actually restrained them from leaving the Council when they became discouraged about reaching an agreement.

The discussion brought out the main points of difference between the Orthodox and the Catholic, Latin Church: the procession of the Holy Spirit, azymes, doctrine of purgatory and the primacy of the Roman Pontiff. After heroic efforts on the part of the Holy Father, the Emperor Bessarion, and Isidore of Kiev, an agreement of union was concluded. The Council debated on the Trinity from January 10, 1438 to June, 1439. It required 33 sessions. The decree of union was announced July 6, 1439. Unfortunately, before the union became solidified, Constantinople was conquered by the Turks and the Eastern Empire was forever lost.

Now, after the passage of over 500 years, some of these differences have been resolved and no doubt the Greeks no longer rely as they did on the Emperor. Granting all this, the work of the Council must take into consideration not only the changes wrought by the past five hundred years but the previous history which wrought the division or schism. This is the reason why the Holy Father has treated the whole matter with such resolute circumspection and charity in his announcements and in the careful deliberation with which the steps for the Council have been taken. What is to be the agenda of the Council?

The Holy Father's first announcements spoke of his three great ideas of "unity, liberty and peace." It was expected, of course, that he would gradually elaborate on the precise scope and means of achieving these ends and some elaboration has been made. A good deal of this elaboration has already been given and more will follow when it is more opportune.

The following compendium of facts about the agenda can now be stated, bearing in mind that nothing is final until the authoritative declaration by the Holy Father.

Pope John XXIII had earlier established a Commission to deal with setting up the Council. Cardinal Tardini was named head of the General Commission. The Commission has a very broad representation. The Secretary of the Commission is Msgr. Pericle Felici of the Roman Rota and other members are: Archbishop Giuseppe Feretto, Assessor of the Sacred Consistorial Congregation; Archbishop Pietro Sigismondi, Secretary of the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith; Archbishop Antonio Samore, Secretary of the Sacred Congregation for Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs; Father Acacio Coussa, a Basilian Father of the Melkite Rite, Assessor of the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church; Msgr. Cesare Zerba, Secretary of the Sacred Congregation of Sacraments; Msgr. Pietro Palazzini, Secretary of the Sacred Congregation of the Council; Msgr. Dino Staffa, Secretary of the Congregation of Seminaries and Universities; Msgr. Enrico Dante, Pro-Secretary of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, and Father Paul Philippe, O.P., Commissary of the Holy Office.

All the Bishops of the world have been asked to send in their suggestions for the agenda to be treated and they were given wide latitude. Furthermore, the Catholic universities of the world have also been asked to send in suggestions. Obviously, therefore, the agenda must be carefully selective and prepared. Most recently, the Holy Father has named members of the preparatory commissions who have begun to gather in Rome to begin work on the actual formulation of the decrees to be discussed. The name of the Council is to be the Second Vatican and it will be held in St. Peter's Basilica. It will be the twenty-first Ecumenical Council. (The Greek Orthodox accept only the first seven Ecumenical Councils, not the eighth which condemned Photius. They accept as ecumenical a Council that propounds a dogma, not merely a disciplinary action.)

Cardinal Tardini has stated that the Eastern bishops not in communion with Rome will not be able to take "an active part" in the Council, but Commissions have been established to deal with them as well as with Protestant religious groups.

There may be discussion carried on between Catholics and Orthodox theologians to try and arrive at an agreeable statement

of doctrine. There may also be discussion with the Protestants. Many have been trying to develop this through the priests in Europe who are in the *Una Sancta* movement; Father Karl Adam and Father Charles Boyer, S.J., have been leaders for years in this movement.

Many Catholics have asked if the Council will try in any way to change the rite of the Greeks in the event that there is a reunion. From all historical indications, there is no thought of asking them to change their rite. The Council of Florence guaranteed them their rite and this has been reiterated constantly to allay their fears. Pope Pius IX in his encyclical, *In Suprema Petri,* addressed to the Orthodox said: "Hence in what touches your sacred rites only those things will be expunged which are opposed to the same Faith and Catholic unity, if such slipped into them in the time of separation; once these are removed, your ancient oriental liturgies will remain safe and fixed." It should also be noted that Pius IX intended that the First Vatican Council would also deal with the problem of unity with the Orthodox churches but the Council never dealt with this matter, being interrupted by civil events.

Among many Easterners, and among the Russian Orthodox, rite is identical with faith. In Greece, the same word is often used to designate dogma and rite. The rite is the expression of the doctrine or dogma or "faith in action" as Yves Congar states. If, for instance, a priest changes the ritual, he may be accused of changing the faith.

This fact is true among those of the Eastern Rites in the United States. A pious and learned member of the Russian Orthodox faith may consider this fact to be a great obstacle to reunion. He may feel that the clergy did not sufficiently distinguish between doctrine and ritual. Yet some priests of the Greek Byzantine Rite, in union with Rome, fear that if they materially changed their long ritual, even for the sake of brevity and convenience, they would have serious difficulties in convincing some of the people that the doctrine had not been changed. Instances are cited of a defection because the Sunday Mass had been shortened, as permitted by the rubrics of the rite; offended members of the parish left and went to an Orthodox church where the ritual had not been changed.

Another problem, not of imminent concern but certainly one which would be met eventually, is the recognition of the orders and positions of the Orthodox priests and prelates. Without making

any predictions of what may be done, we may simply quote the statement of Pius IX on this subject in his encyclical, *In Suprema Petri:*

> Moreover it has been determined and fixed by us that, as regards sacred ministers, priests and prelates who return from these nations to Catholic unity will have the same position they now hold which our predecessors, both of recent and earlier date, have been wont to do; that namely, we will keep for them the same rank and dignities. . . . Finally, we shall embrace both them and the laity, who return to our communion, with the same love as we do other Catholics of the East.

It should be recalled also that the dignity of patriarch, so sacred and noble among them, is not unknown in the West. Venice and earlier, Aquileia, had patriarchs.

Although the agenda necessarily is not complete, we do know that the Holy Father is prepared to act slowly, prudently and charitably in effecting unity. On February 2, 1959, he spoke to the pastors of Rome and speaking of the Ecumenical Council he acknowledged that it would be difficult to compose the differences. He cautioned that in working for Christian reunion, too much attention should not be paid to the historic disputes of the past or to where the blame for the rupture should be placed.

On April 23, 1959, in his letter to the priests of Venice, he said:

> By this we mean to say; in the East first, a step closer, then a step still closer, and finally the perfect reunion of so many separated brothers with the ancient common Mother; and in the West, the generous pastoral collaboration of the two clergies under the watchfullness and direction of the Bishop who is the shepherd of all the lambs.

In the same talk he also said:

> Keeping in mind the brightest pages of the history of centuries, one can well understand that the Ecumenical Council—which we announced after heeding an inspiration whose spontaneity we felt, in the humility of Our soul, a sudden and unexpected impulse—is preparing, in the intimate ranks of the episcopacy and the priesthood to accomplish the good intention of every ecclesiastic, namely, a more anxious desire to enlarge the areas of charity and to maintain its place with clarity of thought and greatness of heart. . . . Do not object if we give in to the desire of our heart and call you brothers and children. Do not object if in the loving way of a father we nourish the hope of your return. . . . Please note that we call you tenderly to the unity of the true

Church; we are not inviting you to a strange home, but to your very own, the common home of the Father.

With such a moving and compelling approach, it may seem to some that no difficulties should be anticipated. Such a roseate view is to ignore history and to fail to take the prudent means necessary to pray and work incessantly to guarantee the success of the Council.

First we must understand the highlights of history that led to the fatal schism between East and West, noting the deep psychological factors involved which have complicated the theological differences.

The Emperor Constantine moved the center of empire from Rome to Constantinople. In the minds of the Greeks who tended to link State with Church, this move impelled them to exalt the importance of the Church authority in Constantinople. The Greeks thought of a theocratic world according to the pattern of Constantine's reign—one Emperor and one Head of the Church who depended largely on the Emperor. The Greek Church canonized Constantine and practically canonized the system he installed. The Greeks did not interpret as we do the phrase about rendering to Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's. The Church was not independent of the Emperor so that one could appeal to the Church's jurisdiction completely independent and perhaps at times at variance with that of the State. Remember that in the West, the Church began in Rome under pagan Emperors and so there was always a keen and constant realization of the separation of the jurisdiction of the Church and State; in fact, for three hundred years the Church was locked in a constant struggle to keep the State out of the sanctuary.

This interlocking of Church and State in the East was most evident in the complicated matter of calling an Ecumenical Council. There can be no Ecumenical Council without the express permission of the Vicar of Christ, but there is no doubt that the active cooperation of the Emperor in the early days of the Church was necessary to enable the bishops to attend. There is no doubt that the convening of the first Ecumenical Council was effected by the Emperor Constantine in Constantinople in cooperation with the Vicar of Christ. It is obvious that in those days, there could not have been such a gathering without this active support of the Emperor because travel was so difficult and every petty civil authority could have

easily impeded the passage of the bishops to the Council at Nicea. Today we only need to think of the impossibility of the attendance of a Council by bishops in Red-dominated territories of the world to realize the need for cooperation by the civil authorities.

As a matter of history, the first eight Ecumenical Councils were called by the Eastern Emperors with the consent and blessing of the Vicar of Christ. These Councils, because of the circumstances, could not have been held without such help. All later Ecumenical Councils were convoked by the Holy Father.

An unwary person could be easily misled into believing, by a rash reading of the records of the Councils that the Emperor has an admitted spiritual power. For instance, we come across this astounding statement of Emperor Constantine about Nicea: "And I am a bishop. You are bishops for the interior business of the Church. I am bishop chosen by God to conduct the exterior business of the Church" (Eusebius, *Vita Const.* iv, c. 24; quoted in Hefele, I, p. 33).

It is also obvious from the testimony of Eusebius who was at the Council of Nicea that Constantine did not preside at the Council even though he gave the opening address. Eusebius said, "After that [the opening address] the Emperor made way for the presidents of the Synod." These words prove that Constantine was only the honorary president; it is thought that the Pope's legates presided. Furthermore, Constantine did not sign the acts of the Council, as far as we know from the records existing. Later, Emperor Basil the Macedonian said at the 8th Ecumenical Council that Constantine had signed the acts of the Council, after the Bishops had signed, showing that he was not a bishop in fact.

It is true, however, that Constantine confirmed the Nicene Creed as soon as it was issued by the Council and he published an edict throughout the Empire making the decrees of the Council civil laws throughout the Empire, threatening with exile those who refused to subscribe to them. Many subsequent emperors did likewise.

The religious beliefs of the subjects were an important factor in the peace and order of the realm in the East. Constantine the Great was deeply interested in the heresy of Arius because it had so disrupted the peace of the Empire, especially around Alexandria. His rival for power, Licinius, espoused the cause of the heathens

and the heretics as means of overturning the power of Constantine and when Licinius was beaten, theological harmony was restored. Constantine sometimes completely underrated the importance of theological discussion, as that of Arius, but he at least understood their connection with public order.

In conformity with this mystique about the Greek Emperor, the Greeks resented deeply the separation of Rome from the protection of the Emperor and the crowning of Charlemagne in St. Peter's Basilica in Rome on Christmas, in the year 800. The stone on which he stood is preserved today in the new basilica, just inside the main door.

The Greeks also resented deeply, and rightly, many of the Crusaders who, instead of protecting them, subjected them. The Fourth Crusade led by Venice actually took and subjected to sack certain parts of Constantinople.

There was the installation of a Latin Emperor and a Latin patriarch. Parts of the Empire were distributed to the Crusaders; a forced latinization was instituted. Fortunately, Pope Innocent III had condemned beforehand the whole outrageous venture.

Some of the words of Pope Innocent IV in his Decretals of 1254 about the traditions of the Church, and the conferral of the Sacrament of Confirmation by priests caused some very damaged feelings. The Pope objected to such conferral by priests and asked that it be given only by bishops.

Aside from all these factors, the East and West drifted apart in their method of defending and explaining their faith, in their apologetics. The Latin Church had to meet the challenge of the Renaissance in knowledge, the inquisitive and probing human mind which developed into the university life of the Middle Ages. Later it had to meet, as it still meets, the intellectual attack of the Reformation. The Church developed its Scholastic philosophy and apologetics based on analysis which presupposes the use of rational inquiry. The East did not suffer these challenges and still largely relies on the authority of the Fathers. The Orthodox faith certainly supports its arguments by rational explanation but it emphasized the arguments from the Fathers. This is evident in the statements of their representatives at the World Council of Churches, as for instance, that held in Evanston a few years ago. This difference in apologetics between the Orthodox and the Catholic Church causes some strain or uneasiness in dialogue about differences.

What must be remembered in speaking about unity is not only whether the Orthodox East is ready but also whether we, the West, are ready. Do we appreciate the diversity of rites and practices as an enrichment of the glory of divine worship? Do we appreciate the achievements of the East and the Greek Empire which survived so much longer than the Roman Empire in the West? Do we accept the differences in practice in their true perspective, conceding that many of them antedate our practices?

To be specific, there should be an appreciation on our part of why priests administer Confirmation. The reason is mostly historical and as such it antedates our customs in the West. In the East, there was a bishop in every city, *Episcopus in omni et sola civitate.* Actually, therefore, there were far more bishops than we have today. The bishop conferred both Baptism and Confirmation. When the growth of the Church made this impossible, he appointed assistants, called *chorepiscopi* or rural bishops to assist him in baptizing and confirming. The *chorepiscopi* or rural bishops generally did not have episcopal orders, being priests with a special title and function. They were assistants to the bishops much as pastors today are assistants to the bishops in baptizing. In the West, the *chorepiscopi* disappeared gradually and by the ninth century had largely disappeared. In the East they continue. But as the parish priest, the pastor, took over their function, he naturally took over their practice of baptising and confirming. This practice was observed in the East but not in the West. Today this is continued in the East and raises many a puzzled if not superior eyebrow in the West.

Secondly, the existence of a married clergy. Obviously, a celibate or married priest can with equal validity administer the sacraments and preach all the articles of faith. Whether celibacy is to be imposed or not is a matter of decision by the Holy Father or the authority in a rite, with the Holy Father's approval. A man can be a good priest, married or unmarried according to the discipline of his rite, since Christ gave a counsel of celibacy but not a command.

The East had a tradition of married clergy and after the twelfth century, the West had almost a universal law of celibacy. Now, since 1951, the Holy See has permitted certain married men in the West to be ordained priests. The first was a Father Rudolf Goethe (a distant cousin of the famous novelist) who was ordained in Mainz in December, 1951, and whose wife had a seat of honor at

his ordination. Subsequently several married men, all converted Protestant ministers, have been ordained in Germany (the bishops have generally explained that they did it because they needed more priests, the best possible reason). Very recently, a married ex-Lutheran minister of Denmark received ordination by Bishop Johannes T. Suhr of Copenhagen. Now, obviously, if the Holy See approves a married man becoming a priest, we can only give thanks to God that there is another priest.

It should also be noted that the Protestants are learning the value of celibacy in the ministry. There is a community of the French Reformed Church at Taize, near the Alps, which practices celibacy as an aid to total devotion to the will of God. Recently, one of their members, Max Thurian, wrote a significant work entitled, *Marriage and Celibacy,* which in general is new testimony to the old truth that celibacy aids complete dedication to Christ.

We often ask ourselves, what can we do? Since the work of union is a spiritual work we can aid by our prayers. We can also aid by our attitude, a recognition of the history and culture of the East and our sincere desire for a union with them. Unity means a mutual action, a reciprocal process. Our interest is vitally needed. For instance, a group of laymen decided before the Church Unity Octave to arrange a display of Eastern ecclesiastical art in the windows of stores in Washington, D. C., and for that purpose they visited every Orthodox priest. In every instance, they received a very cordial welcome and they were loaned an impressive collection of objects of ecclesiastical art. They were displayed in many windows both of Catholic and non-Catholic shop owners.

To achieve unity we must learn to keep our eyes on Christ, to measure everything by its confirmity to His will, to His service. Everyone must see Christ, not us, as the goal of our efforts. As the Holy Father said in a talk about St. Pius X: "The people will run after us, not to seek us, nor to attach themselves to us, but to arrive together with us at the meeting with Jesus Christ who is 'the shepherd and guardian of our souls.'" This is but an echo of the great words of St. Peter: "If you speak, let it be with the words of Christ; if you minister, let it be with the strength of Christ, so that in all things God may be praised through Jesus Christ to whom be all glory and praise forever" (*I Peter,* 4:11).

✠ PHILIP M. HANNAN

Auxiliary Bishop of Washington, D. C.

THEOLOGY AND THE SENSUS PLENIOR

During the past few decades theologians have been reconsidering the meanings which are to be attached to passages of Sacred Scripture. In particular Catholic scholars have considered the possibility of a *sensus plenior* in Sacred Scripture. Today it is disputed whether or not a new classification is to be added to the classic enumeration of the senses of Sacred Scripture: literal, typical, consequent, and accommodated. The discussion has progressed to such a degree that it is now included in many seminary textbooks.[1]

While there is some evidence that the idea had been advanced earlier,[2] the first *ex professo* treatment of the *sensus plenior* was presented by A. Fernandez, S.J., who answers affirmatively the question, "Can it be asked whether or not God sometimes intends through the words of the hagiographer a more abundant, fuller meaning than that which the hagiographer understood and wished to express?"[3] As he describes it, this meaning is understood, though vaguely, by the human author: "The same is known at least in some fashion, namely confusedly, by the hagiographer; therefore it is not accuratedly said to be 'beyond the intention of the hagiographer'. . . . Hence it is abusively called the 'fuller or plural sense.' "[4]

This proposal was not the result of pure speculation concerning *a priori* possibilities. Fr. Fernandez in exemplifying his position states:

[1] E.g. *Institutiones Biblicae*, I, 6 (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1951); P. Hoepfl, O.S.B.—B. Gut, O.S.B., *Introductio Generalis in Sacram Scripturam* 5 (Naples: D'Auria, 1950); M. Nicolau, S.J.—J. Salaverri, S.J., *Sacrae Theologiae Summa*, I, 3 (Madrid: Editorial Catolica, 1952).

[2] Cfr. R. Brown, S.S., *The Sensus Plenior in Sacred Scripture* (Baltimore: St. Mary's University, 1955), p. 91; also "The Theory of a *Sensus Plenior*," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 15 (1953) 141-142. The article elicited a remark by J. Weisengoff, "Inerrancy of the Old Testament in Religious Matters," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 17 (1955) 136, note 24. This in turn provoked an exchange of letters to the editor of the review; cfr. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 17 (1955) 451-455; 18 (1956) 47-53. Fr. Brown's book is excellent for the whole question.

[3] *Institutiones Biblicae*, I, 6, p. 381. Brown, *op. cit.*, p. 88 states that it was the same in the second edition.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 383.

God through various prophets described the lines of the future Messianic kingdom. Now, just as in a picture or in a church a full judgment concerning the complete force and beauty of the single parts can only be made if all of the parts . . . are seen, so one must have before his eyes the whole picture of the Messianic kingdom to perceive the full meaning of the single lines. . . . Thus when one sees a prophecy fulfilled, he understands far more clearly many things which were obscure in it. There can be no doubt that God intended and wished to express this fuller meaning in the words of the sacred author.[5]

Exegetes have been moved to accept the *sensus plenior* because of a consideration of the manner in which the authors of the New Testament employ and interpret the Old Testament. Perhaps the most extensive example of such exegesis is found in the *Epistle to the Hebrews*. Other examples cited by some as showing a *sensus plenior* include the use of *Isaias* 7:14 in *Matthew* 1:22, the use of *Isaias* 29:13 in *Matthew* 15:7-8, and the use of *Psalm* 8:7 in *I Corinthians* 15:26.

Some exegetes find support for the notion of a *sensus plenior* in the manner in which certain Fathers of the Church interpreted certain parts of the Bible; these commentators also find support for the notion in the way in which Scriptural texts are used in the liturgy. It is denied, therefore, that every use which is not obviously literal or consequent is to be considered typical or merely accommodation.

Perhaps the best known example of such a type of exegesis—though not necessarily the most secure—is found in the Trinitarian hints or references in the Old Testament. There is no doubt that many Fathers found such, here and there, as—for example—in the use of the plural in "God said, 'Let us make mankind in our image and likeness' "[6] and "He said, 'Indeed! the man has become like one of us.' "[7] The rigid monotheism of the Jews would seem to have precluded to the human author any clear concept of the plurality of persons in the Godhead; certainly the Jewish people did not suspect the truth of the Trinity. Thus if there be any veiled reference to the Holy Trinity in the cited texts it would be contained not in the direct literal sense but in the *sensus plenior* intended by God, the principal Author of Scripture.

[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 381-382.
[6] *Gen.* 1: 26 (CCD translation).
[7] *Gen.* 3: 22 (CCD translation).

Not everyone who admits that there is a *sensus plenior* allows some knowledge of it to the human author.[8] We should perhaps speak of *sensus pleniores* and not of the *sensus plenior*. This lack of agreement confuses the discussion because, unless an author defines his use of the term, it is equivocal and in some instances confusing beyond measure. It seems to the present author that some of the attacks directed against the *sensus plenior* are actually directed only against a concept that does not demand at least some knowledge in the human author of the further meaning.

As we have seen, the first consideration of the possibility of some fuller signification found in certain words of Sacred Scripture arose from exegetical considerations regarding parts of the inspired text. Most of the proofs adduced for a *sensus plenior* are *a posteriori;* the only other arguments used are *ex convenientia.*[9]

If one considers the *sensus plenior* in the manner of Fr. Fernandez, it would seem that no one would seriously object to its possibility on an *a priori* basis because the fuller meaning is formally implicit in the words of the human author.[10] All that is needed to derive it is a clearer declaration of the terms. We find a commonplace example of this when someone perfects a statement of ours and we say, "That is exactly what I mean," realizing that we would never have expressed our meaning with such clarity if left to ourselves. Such interpretation by another is to be attributed to his superior knowledge or understanding. Applying this to interpretors of Sacred Scripture, we should not be surprised that those who have had the benefit of further revelation can understand better than the original human author himself the implications of a particular text. This observation has particular application when we consider prophecies, but it finds application elsewhere as well. We should note these words of Father Brown:

> There might be mentioned the fact that today Catholic exegetes are calling into question the strict *literal* Messianic import of some O.T. prophecies . . . , and turning toward a secondary Messianic sense. It

---

[8] A glance at the appendix of Fr. Brown's work shows this.

[9] R. Brown, *op. cit.*, p. 95; cfr. J. Weisengoff's review of *Problèmes et Methodes d'Exégèse Theologique* in *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 14 (1952) 84 f.

[10] We shall not discuss the possibility of a *sensus plenior typicus.*

is claimed that such prophecies had a fulfillment in their own times.[11] . . . Most of the authors admit that in at least some of the examples of the *sensus plenior* the human author was unconscious of the increase in meaning that his text would later receive.[12]

Yet are those exegetes fully justified in holding such opinions? While admitting that many prophecies seem to demand some fulfillment in the historic circumstances in which they were proffered, must we hold that there had to be a complete fulfillment of the author's words in such circumstances? Could not something of an incipient or partial fulfillment have been sufficient? Is a mixed context possible at times?

Occasionally the solution to a difficulty found in a prophecy can be found in the application to it of the Semitic concept of totality.[13] The Semite and hence the ancient Jew could see in an individual the whole human race or a large group, or in a particular king an entire dynasty. Because of this, a Semitic author could predicate truthfully of a forebear something which was actually realized only in one of his descendants. It would also be true that something could be predicated of a man's son which would be realized not in the immediate offspring, or at least not entirely in him, but in a later descendant. We have an example of this in *II Samuel* 7:12-16.[14]

To the present writer it seems that the only way in which we can see Our Blessed Lady in the "woman" of *Genesis* 3:14 is by applying the totality concept to that word. In the context the reference is to the woman of the context, namely Eve, but it is also to Mary in Eve. While the usual words which have this extension of totality are masculine or express masculine realities, the idea that a feminine noun could have such extension cannot

[11] R. Brown, *op. cit.*, p. 76. Italics his.

[12] *Ibid.*, p. 129.

[13] Cfr. B. LeFrois, S.V.D., "Semetic Totality Thinking," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 17 (1955) 315-323.

[14] B. LeFrois, *loc. cit.*, p. 321; also G. Bressan, F.D.P., *Samuele* (Turin: Marietti, 1954), pp. 536-538; R DeVaux, O.P., *Les Livres de Samuel, Bible de Jerusalem* (Paris: du Cerf, 1953), p. 162, states of v. 13: "An evident reference to Solomon; compare 1 (i.e. 3) Kings 5: 19; 8: 16-20. But the v. is out of harmony with the context which envisages all the Davidic line and obscurely the Messias to come." The eminent exegete seems to have overlooked the fact that eternity is promised to the line in the same v. 13.

be excluded purely on the ground of its gender. It is true that lineage is generally considered only as it comes through the male; yet the feminine element is not totally neglected. If it were, much of the teaching of the book of Ruth would disappear since there God's mercy and goodness to a woman who was born a pagan is emphasized; this mercy extends beyond her own lifetime because one of the ways in which God showed His favor to her was by causing David to come from her offspring.

This further determination of the reference of the totality concept could well be called a *sensus plenior*. Certainly the inspired author did not have to know with the same clarity with which we can know it the full import of his statement; yet if we were to ask him today whether or not he meant what we see in his inspired writing, he would also assure us, with his increased understanding, that he did mean it. Our meaning is implicit in his statement. The inspired author would not have had to know, for example, how many generations would have to pass before the oracle of Nathan was completely fulfilled; all that he knew was that it would be fulfilled in some descendant of David.

While an exhaustive study of every text to which the totality concept can be applied would perhaps surpass any man's ability, and while an exhaustive study of its possible application to those texts advanced by various proponents of a *sensus plenior* would take us well beyond any practical limits, the pursuit of this line of thought may prove rewarding. Of course, the application of the totality concept is not necessarily the only one that can be made by an exegete who demands some knowledge in the sacred human author of the further signification of the words which he employed. Perhaps the doctrine concerning retribution given in *Psalm 72* provides an example of such a possibility.

The line of thought proposed here seems to meet the objections of those who object to the *sensus plenior* on the grounds of the doctrine of inspiration.[15] Moreover, this line of thought seems free of the inconveniences found in the presentation on the part of some authors, who defend the notion of a *sensus plenior* com-

[15] Cfr. R. Bierberg, C.Pp.S., "Does Sacred Scripture Have a *Sensus Plenior?*," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 10 (1948) 182-195; especially to be consulted are pp. 185-187, 189-192. This is the best known adversative critique of the *sensus plenior*, though by no means the only one.

pletely unknown to the sacred human author. To the present writer the objection that can validly be directed against their position is this: logically there is demanded a double literal sense. While those who argue for such a *sensus plenior* unknown to the human author deny that they hold the possibility of a multiple literal sense, an analysis of their statements seems to show that they do indeed admit such a possibility.[16] Words taken in two different senses, even though the senses are related or connected, are taken in two different senses. This is multiplicity of senses; inasmuch as we are concerned with the meanings of word, this is multiplicity of literal senses. But where we are concerned with the unique situation of Scripture, involving two authors—God and the inspired writer—we cannot expect to solve all the problems by an analysis of purely human authorship.

JOHN J. O'ROURKE

Saint Charles Seminary
Overbrook
Philadelphia, Penn.

[16] R. Brown, *op. cit.*, p. 129: "Well then, one may cry out triumphantly, if you admit that the *sensus plenior* and the literal sense may consist of different formal concepts, you have returned to the bizarre theory of a multiple literal sense. Not at all; such a theory allows for an application of one passage to *unrelated* realities. Here . . . we insist: (1) that the doctrines be related . . . ; (2) that the fuller meaning be close to the literal meaning, so that the words are not used in an entirely different sense, but in one closely connected to the original. As far as we know, not one adherent of the fuller sense accepts the theory of a multiple literal sense." Italics his.

THE LAPSED CATHOLIC

We Catholics build countless primary and secondary schools at great cost, and employ a vast army of priests, sisters, brothers and lay-teachers for the express purpose of saving the Catholic Faith for our children. We have the Mission Crusade, other mission organizations, convert clubs and publish countless books, pamphlets and magazines for the purpose of making converts to the Faith. For these reasons it seems all the more a mystery why there is no organized or sustained effort in the Church to bring the fallen-away Catholics back (and there are untold millions of them to say nothing of their children). One estimate, recently made, puts their number at 15,000,000 in the United States alone.

Surely Our Lord is intensely concerned about them. They are His very own. In the Holy Gospels He has expended four of His most striking parables showing His tender love for them. The parables of the Good Shepherd, the lost groat, the prodigal son and the Good Samaritan all tell us of that same great love. We are all moved and consoled by those parables, but it seems that we Catholics of today have been putting the wrong interpretation on their application. We expect Our Lord to go out and bring the lost sheep back without any, or at least, almost no effort on our part. But that is not the way grace works. We must get into the picture in the ordinary providence of God. And surely the return of the prodigal is one of the greatest of graces.

Prayer, the seven sacraments, and even the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass with all their infinite power to give grace are inoperative without us. It is God who does all through the infinite merits of Jesus Christ but we, the members of Christ's Mystical Body, are the ordinary channels through which that grace is applied. If the lost sheep and the prodigals are not brought back to the fold it will be because we did not go out and search for them until we found them. They will not come home; they have to be brought home.

Perhaps one reason we have failed so generally in this work of divine charity is that we have tried to accomplish it by talk rather than by using the means God has provided for its accomplishment; or if we used the proper means we had no plan by which to work,

and we did not persevere. Here is one example of planned and sustained effort.

In a Kentucky parish of some 400 families there are 175 men, women and children in the parish itself, and another 100 who have joined in the work from surrounding parishes, making 275 persons in all. Each of these has accepted the sponsorship of one fallen-away Catholic somewhere. They work for his or her return to the practice of the Faith in the following way:

1. Besides the Mass they must themselves assist at on all Sundays and Holy Days of Obligation to fulfill their duty, they assist at another Mass either on Sunday or on a week day to make up for the Mass of obligation that is missed by the lost sheep or assisted at by him in the state of mortal sin. In this way the sponsor is fulfilling the obligation for him, or fulfilling it more perfectly.

2. Besides his own rosary (five decades) that every good Catholic ought to say every day, the sponsor agrees to say a second rosary to make up for the rosary his charge fails to say. This second rosary is said as a fervent appeal to Our Blessed Mother for the conversion of his charge. To the sponsor, Mary is the court of last appeal, the hope of those in despair, the hope of the hopeless.

3. As an added appeal to Our Lady the sponsor says the *Memorare* for all engaged in sponsorial work and their charges daily.

4. Each day the sponsor offers some of his other prayers, works, joys, sufferings and temptations for the conversion of the person entrusted to him.

This plan has been working in the parish for over twenty years and although not every sponsor has always done all the work he or she agreed to do, not a single fallen-away Catholic with a sponsor has died unrepentant, and many have returned to the vigorous practice of their Faith. The results have been so phenomenal and so much like miracles of grace that those who know the effects of the work become absolutely certain that no lost sheep can possibly die out of the Church if he has a faithful sponsor. No Catholic with even a particle of love for the lost sheep, such as Our Lord must have, can observe this work without unbounded joy. He feels like a poor miner who has dug for gold all his life without finding any and finally discovers a deposit of untold wealth. To every Catholic in the world he would like to say: "There's gold in them thar

hills," meaning the hills of the Mass, the Rosary, the *Memorare* and good works.

The name of this little association, if it had a name, might well be "The Marian Associates for the Conversion of Difficult Cases," since it leans heavily on the intercession of the Blessed Virgin for success. That is the first reason why it succeeds, but there are other reasons why it cannot fail. In many of our prayers we ask for something that would not be good for us or for the ones we pray for; for something that it would not please God to give. In asking for the return of a lost sheep we are asking for something that God the Father, Our Blessed Lord, the Blessed Mother, all the saints on earth and the entire court of Heaven all want. And yet, this great good, like the offering of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, the administration and reception of the sacraments and the creation of new life is made contingent on the co-operation of us men. God and all creation await breathless for us to begin.

R. J. GETTELFINGER

New Haven, Kentucky

ST. JEROME'S ATTITUDE TOWARD MARRIAGE AND WOMEN

I

When the late Pope Pius XII addressed the International Union of Family Organizations in September, 1957, the American press gave the public a striking demonstration of its ability to disregard the truth for the sake of a headline. The headlines gave the impression that the Pope had forbidden widows to remarry, and even some Catholics were indignant at the thought that widows were being singled out for special restrictive legistion. However, it soon became clear to those who went beyond the headlines of the morning papers that such righteous indignation was being wasted. They discovered that the Pope was really not a widow-hater, nor did he condemn a second marriage for a woman who cared to remarry after the death of her husband.

What the Pope said was, of course, not new at all. There was no restrictive legislation being passed, neither did the Holy Father even imply that a widow is to be blamed if she exercises her freedom to remarry. The Pontiff was simply emphasizing for our times the excellence of that counsel of perfection taught by St. Paul: "As for a wife, she is yoked to her husband as long as he lives; if her husband is dead, she is free to marry anyone she will, so long as she marries in the Lord. But more blessed is she, if she remains as she is, in my judgment . . ." (*I Cor.* 7:39-40). The burden of the papal discourse was that, although second marriages are not condemned, the Church has a predilection for those who utilize the opportunities for spiritual advancement which widowhood provides.

Almost sixteen centuries ago, we find in the writings of St. Jerome a similar commentary on this teaching of St. Paul. Jerome desired to interpret this doctrine for those of his own time, but in so doing he promptly found himself involved in controversy. Jerome did not have to contend with morning papers, but there were plenty of men who were anxious to interpret his words so that they would reflect discredit on him. Indeed, the work of discrediting him was done so well that even today it is quite usual to

find the scholarly hermit depicted as a man who hated marriage and women. The work around which most of this criticism of Jerome has revolved is the *Adversus Jovinianum* which he wrote in 393 in answer to a work which Jovinian wrote three years earlier.

Jerome's answer to Jovinian consists of two books which take up in succession the four points which Jovinian made the basis of his teachings. Only the first book need concern us, since this is the one which deals with the matter of marriage and virginity. According to Jerome, Jovinian taught that "virgins, widows and married women, who have been once passed through the laver of Christ, if they are on a par in other respects, are of equal merit" (chapter 3).[1] This and Jovinian's other doctrines had been condemned in 390 by a council held in Rome. In 391, St. Ambrose renewed the condemnation in a synod held in Milan. When Jerome undertook his task in 393, he was answering a request for a more detailed refutation of Jovinian's teaching which had evidently gained quite a vogue in the Roman world.

At the outset, Jerome seeks to remove the claim that his rival is simply defending marriage and that he and the true Church are Manichaeans who condemn marriage and regard all marital intercourse as impure. Jerome observes that Jovinian's style is such that everything depends on everything else and the result is such that one feels that he is writing in a feverish dream. All he says suits everything equally well, because it fits nothing at all: "This circumstance led me shrewdly to suspect that his object in proclaiming the excellence of marriage was only to disparage virginity." This is what stirs Jerome's ire and inspires the reply which is often sharp and somewhat exaggerated. Basically, he wants to establish this truth: "While we honour marriage we prefer virginity, which is the offspring of marriage. . . . Virginity is to marriage what fruit is to the tree, or grain to the straw" (chapter 3).

The first section of the *Adversus Jovinanum* (chapters 4-13) is devoted to a detailed exegesis of *I Corinthians 7*, and Jovinian's doctrines are refuted point by point. It must be remembered that

[1] All quotations from St. Jerome's works are taken from the translation contained in volume VI of the *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, edd. P. Schaff and H. Wace (New York: Christian Literature Co., 1893).

Jerome is writing a polemical tract and that the tone of it is controversial and meant to convince. This should help to explain the method of argumentation employed.

St. Paul declared that it is good for a man not to touch a woman. St. Jerome now takes this and constructs an argument which proceeds thus: what is opposite to good is bad. If it is good not to touch a woman, it is bad to touch a woman. That, for his purpose, is enough to show that virginity is preferable to marriage. He does not concern himself with the niceities of logic but goes right to his main point, namely that St. Paul was teaching that virginity is preferable to marriage. Similarly, he tells us that St. Paul exhorts us to pray always, and "as often as I render to my wife her due, I cannot pray." Jerome teaches too that after intercourse, husband and wife should abstain for a time from the Body of Christ (chapter 7).[2] Here again, his interest is not speculative as much as polemical; he wants to heap up authority for his thesis and really is making no great pretensions toward speculative justification of his position.

It is true that virginity is not commanded by the Apostle, but this simply because of the temptations of life. Christ loves virgins more than others because they are willing to give what is not commanded, but merely counselled and recommended (chapter 12). Similarly, St. Paul said that it is better to marry than to burn, but "the reason why it is better to marry is that it is worse to burn. Let burning lust be absent and he will not say it is better to marry" (chapter 9). A man does his wife honor when he abstains from intercourse (chapter 7).

In these and similar passages in this first part of the work, Jerome states quite strongly the case for virginity and against marriage, but he is careful to introduce correctives throughout his discourse lest his rhetorical language lead him into the opposite error of Manichaeism.

If virginity is wheaten bread, marriage is barley and not the dung of fornication (chapter 7). Even though there is a difference between gift and gift, marriage is still a gift of God (chapter 8).

[2] See also letter to Pammachius, XLVIII, 15. For the history of this teaching in Catholic tradition, see E. C. Messenger, *Two in One Flesh* (Westminster: Newman Press, 1948), II, 146 ff.

Another time he tells us that "the difference, then, between marriage and virginity is as great as that between not sinning and doing well, nay rather, to speak less harshly, as great as between good and better" (chapter 13). Still, he does not justify virginity at any price and points out that neither celibacy nor marriage is worth anything without good works (chapter 11).

In the next section of the book (chapters 14-39), Jerome deals with other evidence for virginity which is found in the books of the Old and New Testaments. Evidently, many of the passages which he discusses were used by Jovinian in his work. Jerome takes them up, often refers to the arguments used by his opponent, and then proceeds to use them for his own purpose.

The love of husband and wife is a sign or type of the love of Christ for His Church. But just as Christ loved His Church chastely, so a man should love his wife chastely (chapter 16). The Canticle of Canticles contains the mysteries of virginity (chapter 30). Evidently Jovinian had made capital of this book in advancing his argument. To the virgin evangelist, John, had been reserved the privilege of expounding doctrines so sublime that no married man could declare them, and to the virgin apostle, the Virgin Lord entrusted the Virgin Mother (chapter 26).

Jerome has told us that not all intercourse is impure, but he shows that he approves of intercourse only because of the procreation of children (chapter 20). But still there is a difference between marriage and virginity: while marriage replenishes the earth, virginity fills paradise (chapter 16). The argument that preaching virginity would counter the command to increase and multiply is dispatched swiftly. Jerome calms Jovinian's fears on this score. He assures his adversary that there is no fear that the population of the world will suddenly die out. One can feel that Jerome is speaking from experience when he says: "Virginity is a hard matter, and therefore rare, because it is hard" (chapter 36).

It is true that second, third, and even eighth marriages are permitted because of the fear of fornication, that is, as a concession to those who are too weak to practice continence (chapter 14). But still Jerome sees in Christ's presence at the marriage feast at Cana not only a blessing on marriage but also an approval of widowhood. Since we are told in the Gospels of only one occasion that Christ attended a marriage feast, Christ meant to teach us that a man

should marry only once and should not remarry after the death of his wife (chapter 40).

Jovinian seems to have appealed to the physical organs of male and female as a proof that their use in marriage was intended by God. Jerome, of course, does not deny that men and women are differentiated by different sex organs, nor that they are suited for generative acts. His response is characteristic of his type of argumentation. He simply retorts that the implication seems to be that we should always use them for generative purposes since they are capable of that use, and that we should never forego lust. St. Paul teaches continence, but could he teach continence if it were against nature? Surely, having distinctive sex organs does not mean that we have to use them. Look at the example of Our Lord Who came to earth as a man complete with all the organs of a man even though He did not intend to use them for generation. So too the eunuchs who have made themselves such for the kingdom of heaven. Furthermore, at the resurrection of the bodies at the last day, there will be no marriage: "What others will be hereafter in heaven, that virgins begin to be on earth" (chapter 36).

Finally, it should be pointed out that in the section under discussion, there is a chapter (chapter 28) which contains much material which appears to be definitely anti-feminist. Jerome quotes a series of scriptural texts, especially from the Book of Proverbs, which are no compliment to wives. Jerome comments: "See how a wife is classed with the greatest evils." He says that it does not matter that what Scripture says is strictly true only of an odious wife. The mere possibility of such a danger is enough: "For he who marries a wife is uncertain whether he is marrying an odious woman or one worthy of his love. If she is odious, she is intolerable; if worthy of love, her love is compared to the grave, to the parched earth and to fire." Is it any wonder that Jerome is often called a woman hater? Later we will examine the justice of this designation.

In the last section of his first book (chapters 41-49), Jerome devotes himself mainly to the testimony that he can find in ancient sources, chiefly Greek and Roman history, which shows the excellence of virginity. In Chapter 47 he quotes a long passage from the book "On Marriage" which was attributed to Theophrastus. It is a biting satire on marriage and specifically on wives. Its purpose is to prove the proposition that a wise man should not marry, and

indeed, the indictment is such that if accepted literally, a man would certainly be a fool if he did take a wife. Such comment as Jerome makes on it does not commit him to approval of the particular things said in it, but at least a general approval is implied, and, at any rate, he finds it a handy weapon with which to beat his opponent.

His last chapter is, at least in part, a plea for chastity in marriage, by which he means reasoned love. He tells us that it is "disgraceful to love another man's wife at all, or one's own too much." A wise man should love his wife with judgment, not with passion: "There is nothing blacker than to love a wife as if she were an adulteress." In a woman, chastity holds the primacy among all virtues: "This it is that makes up for a wife's poverty, enhances her riches, redeems her deformity, gives grace to her beauty" (chapter 49).

How should we interpret all this? Is it true, as has often been said, that Jerome disparaged, even condemned, marriage and that he was a hater of women who preached that they are an evil scourge?[3] There is no doubt that a strong case for these propositions could be made if one reads literally everything Jerome said in the *Adversus Jovinianum*. Some of these things were quite devastating and could be represented as deliberate attacks on marriage and women. Of course, in doing so it would be necessary to overlook the passages which praise women and marriage. However, it might be argued that favorable passages are overbalanced by Jerome's sharp sayings in other places.

If we are to make a just estimate of what Jerome said, we should take a look at some of his letters and examine his literary methods before we render our final verdict.[4]

One good test is this: what did his contemporaries think of his work? No doubt there were some who knew Jerome well and placed a moderate interpretation on his words. However, there is also no doubt that there were those who condemned Jerome as a Manichaean.

[3] Rather typical of this sort of comment is that contained in the introduction to the translation in the *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers:* "The treatise gives a remarkable specimen of Jerome's system of interpreting scripture, and also of the methods by which asceticism was introduced into the Church and marriage brought into disesteem."

[4] For material on Jerome's literary education and tradition, see Edwin A. Quain, S.J. "St. Jerome as a Humanist," *A Monument to St. Jerome,* ed. Francis X. Murphy, C.SS.R. (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1952).

We are certain of this from three letters which Jerome wrote: two of them were to his friend Pammachius and one to Domnio.[5]

Pammachius had written to Jerome informing him that he and some of his friends had withdrawn from circulation some copies of the *Adversus Jovinianum* because of the attacks that had been made on it.[6] Some of Jerome's enemies had charged that he so exalted virginity and depreciated marriage that there is no comparison between virgin and wife and that he had, in effect, condemned marriage.[7] This Jerome will not admit; he insists that he was refuting Jovinian's doctrine and finds that in the Church's condemnation of Jovinian he is justified. To call virginity gold and marriage silver is to exalt virginity over marriage, but it is not to deny that silver is any the less silver. Each has its own value even though one is inferior to the other. Can a man be said to condemn marriage who says that husbands are not to put away their wives?[8] If married men resent his saying that one cannot receive the rewards of chastity while rendering the debt of marriage, let them vent their anger on Scripture, not on Jerome.[9]

Jerome also tries rather desperately to defend his reasoning that it is wrong to touch a woman. It would appear that the defense is still not very good because he never attempts to justify speculatively his position which is open to attack on the basis of the logic employed. However, he does clarify the point somewhat by saying what was not by any means clear before: "You see, therefore, that I am not expounding the law as to husband and wives, but simply discussing the general question of sexual intercourse—how in comparison with chastity and virginity, the life of angels, 'It is good for a man not to touch a woman.' "[10] He still has not explained how he can say, without qualification, that it is bad to touch a woman. It is probably precisely this inability or unwillingness to make necessary distinctions which caused the misunderstanding and gave a handle to his enemies.

[5] There seems to be no ground for Grützmacher's statement that these friends had disavowed Jerome and that he was bitter toward them: George Grützmacher, *Hieronymous* (Berlin: Trowitsch, 1906), II, 164-165.

[6] Letter XLVII.

[7] *Ibid.*, n. 2.

[8] *Ibid.*, n. 4.

[9] *Ibid.*, n. 10.

[10] *Ibid.*, n. 14.

Similarly, Jerome had obviously been attacked for insisting that intercourse between husband and wife makes it impossible to fulfill St. Paul's injunction to pray always. He is unwilling to move from his literalistic interpretation of the injunction which envisages formal prayer as the thing which the Apostle commends. He finds it helpful to quote Paul's saying that husbands and wives should occasionally refrain from intercourse so that they can give themselves to prayer, but he passes over the fact that there are many kinds of prayer and Paul speaks of them in different contexts. If Jerome was misunderstood, he had only himself to blame.

Basically, the letter to Pammachius tries to justify his position that virginity is superior to marriage. We can and should, it seems, look on it as a plea by Jerome that what he has said in his work be interpreted in accord with this basic position. This, of course, is precisely what his enemies are unwilling to do. But he labors to make his point clear by forceful reiteration:

> With my last breath, then, I protest that neither now nor at any former time have I condemned marriage. I have merely answered an opponent without any fear that they of my own party would lay snares for me. I extol virginity to the skies, not because I myself possess it, but because, not possessing it, I admire it all the more. Surely it is a modest and ingenuous confession to praise in others that which you lack yourself. The weight of my body keeps me fixed to the ground, but do I fail to admire the flying birds or praise the dove . . .?[11]

Here we have not only a statement of his own position, but a plea for understanding coupled with a disarming frankness which is so characteristic of this remarkable man. There was nothing small about his soul, and beneath an exterior which can often be gruff, there is a passionate devotion which gives warmth to his personality.

In this first letter to Pammachius, there is a section which gives us a good insight into Jerome's method of writing, and he meant it as a sort of guide to direct his readers in the understanding of his writings.[12] Jerome comes back to the point that he simply prefers virginity to marriage and adds that "the wise and generous reader ought to have judged what seemed hard sayings by my general

[11] *Ibid.*, n. 20. Grützmacher commends acidly that his own past lapses made it impossible for Jerome to believe in chastity in marriage; see *Hieronymous*, II, 168.

[12] *Ibid.*, n. 12-13.

drift, and not to have charged me with putting forward inconsistent opinions in one and the same book. For who is so dull and so inexperienced in writing as to praise and condemn one and the same object, as to destroy what he has built up, and to build up what he has destroyed; and when he has vanquished his opponent, to turn his sword, last of all, against himself?"

Jerome complains that his opponents are content with faultfinding but will not point out his errors. Instead of marshalling their arguments as he had, they have not made use of the liberal education they received, but acted like men who were country-bred and unacquainted with the arts of rhetoric and logic. He will not be content with persons who stand in security and shout directions to the warrior who is engaged in battle, but he does fear that when people see him wounded in this warfare, they will become too cautious in their fighting: "I would not have you engage in an encounter in which you will have nothing to do but to protect yourself, your right hand remaining motionless while your left manages your shield. You must strike or fall. I cannot account you a victor unless I see your opponent put to the sword." This is a good statement of Jerome's general spirit in polemic; there is nothing diffident or tentative about the engagement; it must be decisive.

The task of a disputant, Jerome tells us, is a special one and requires special methods. He scorns the advice of the man who teaches that a thrust must be direct and there should be no feinting: "As if it were not the perfection of fighting to menace one part and to strike another." He points to the ancient authors, Demosthenes, Cicero and Aristotle, also to Origen, Eusebius, Tertullian, Cyprian and others; in them one finds rhetorical devices and artifice to win a victory. St. Paul himself seems to use not words, but peals of thunder: "His words seem simplicity itself: the expressions of a guileless and unsophisticated person, one who has no skill either to plan a dilemma or to avoid it. Still, whichever way you look, they are thunderbolts. His pleading halts, yet he carries every point which he takes up. He turns his back upon his foe only to overcome him; he simulates flight, but only that he may slay." Look to Christ Himself; He spoke to the crowd in parables and to his disciples He gave the interpretation: "To teach a disciple is one thing; to vanquish an opponent, another." Jerome's words certainly have the sound of one who is preaching a certain duplicity, but still he

shows that the man who tries to justify the means by the result will receive no support from him.[13]

In his second letter to Pammachius, Jerome speaks of the first letter which he has dedicated to his friend and which he is enclosing.[14] It is written as an answer to the attacks of his enemies and the author desires his friend to circulate it if he thinks fit. Jerome also thanks Pammachius for having withdrawn from circulation some of the copies of the *Adversus Jovinianum,* and recognizes the kindness and foresight of a friend in this action. However, the action is of no avail since the books have circulated even in the provinces. Jerome complains that he is not as fortunate as some of the writers of the day who are able to revise their works. Once he has written something, either his admirers or ill-wishers seize upon it and broadcast it among the people. It becomes the center of an excess of eulogy or criticism; not because of its merits but because of the angry feelings of those involved, his work becomes a center of storm. It is possible that Jerome was being too dramatic. He often tended to exaggerate the opposition against him and felt that he was being persecuted mercilessly.

His letter to Domnio deals with another attack levelled against him at Rome.[15] It seems that an anonymous, ignorant monk had been attacking the *Adversus Jovinianum,* and Domnio wrote to Jerome and told him of the occurrence. Jerome's contempt and scorn are turned against his detractor, and in this monk he finds a theme worthy of his talents. He characterizes him as a "lounger who is to be seen in the streets, at the crossings, and in public places; a monk who is a noisy newsmonger, clever only in detraction, and eager, in spite of the beam in his own eye, to remove the mote from his neighbor's. And you tell me that he preaches publicly against me, gnawing, rending and tearing asunder with his fangs the books which I have written against Jovinian." Most of the letter goes on in this vein, a vast *argumentum ad hominem.* Finally, he ends with a strong assertion of his position: he is irked that his opponent has not written anything but has contented himself with vague implications, chatter on street corners and buffoonery: "Let him put forth his hand, put pen to paper and bestir himself; let

[13] *Ibid.,* n. 13-14.
[14] Letter XLIX.
[15] Letter L.

him write books and prove in them all he can. Let him give me a chance of replying to his eloquence. I can return bite for bite, if I like; when hurt myself, I can fix my teeth in my opponent. I too have had a liberal education." Indeed, this last point needs no emphasis for he has given sufficient evidence of this education in his command of rhetorical and satirical language. His final thrust is a gem: "But if he refuses to write, and fancies that abuse is as effective as criticism, then, in spite of all the lands and seas and peoples which lie between us, he must hear at least the echo of my cry, 'I do not condemn wedlock.' Indeed—and this I say to make my meaning quite clear to him—I should like everyone to take a wife who, because they get frightened in the night, cannot sleep alone."

These letters show us that the *Adversus Jovinianum* did arouse attack among Jerome's contemporaries. What it said was misunderstood, either deliberately or in good faith. His own strong views and his gift for invective had gained many enemies for him throughout the Roman world, and he could expect nothing more than he received. Even he seems to have been aware that his rhetorical method of expression is so much a part of him that a torrent of words pours from his pen when he is trying to refute an opponent. When hurt he sinks his teeth into his opponent.

There should be little need to point out now that Jerome's attitude toward marriage is in no way comparable to that of the Manichaeans. We have heard him many times assert his meaning, and we have seen that he himself expected that people would have enough goodness and generosity to interpret individual statements in the light of his general contention.

(To be continued)

GERARD J. CAMPBELL, S.J.

Loyola College
Baltimore, Md.

SHADOWS CAST BY FUTURE EVENTS

The subject which draws the largest crowds and sustains the greatest interest at the Adult Education Centers in Chicago is admittedly Sacred Scripture. Catholics throughout the United States are opening their Bibles and coming in contact with the Word of God. But as an inevitable result of this interest in Scripture and also of a renewed investigation of Christian sources, especially of the Fathers of the Church, there has been a growing concern for the study of *types* in the Old Testament. The wonderful revival of liturgical studies has given many a strong love of liturgical prayer with its rich use of types. Even the constantly growing number of Scripture study clubs in the ordinary parishes are finding themselves faced again and again with the problem of types. What is a type? How is it used?

A type, as we will speak of it, is a technical term through which one designates a person, an event, an institution of the Old Testament which announces a personage, an event, or an institution of the New. The word itself is a simple transcription of τύπος, from a Greek verb which means "to beat." Literally τύπος would be the material trace left by a cut. As the doubting Thomas says: "Unless I see in your hands the τύπος of the nails, I will not believe."[1] Saint Stephen, referring to the Book of Exodus, speaks of the tabernacle which Moses constructed according to the τύπος (or form) which God showed him on Sinai.[2]

By extension, the word designates an emblem, a figure, which gives in advance the idea of a future thing. Saint Paul says: "In this, Adam was the *type* of him who was to come."[3] So we come to the technical sense of the word.

Saint Paul has the word take on the sense of a moral teaching, a lesson, and especially of an *example* when he says: "Walk according to the τύπος which you have in me."[4] In speaking of the feasts of the Old Law, the new moons and the sabbath days, he

[1] *John*, 20:25.
[2] *Acts*, 7:44.
[3] *Rom.*, 5:14.
[4] *Phil.*, 3:17.

exclaims: "All these were but shadows cast by future events (*umbra futurorum*), the reality is found in Christ."[5] The priests of the Old Law were only "men who devote their service to the type and the shadow of what has its true being in heaven."[6] In the very first verse of the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Greek seems to imply that God spoke fragmentarily and under various figures.

Saint Peter also tells us that the "ark which Noe was then building . . . was a type of the baptism which saves us now."[7] A type, therefore, has gained the sense of a figure, a lesson, and an example!

But to affirm the existence in the Old Testament of realities, and of deeds, which announce other realities and other deeds produced in the new economy of salvation, is only to profess the unity of revelation across the ages. God has prepared for His great revelation of His Son and His Church for many years. This preparation from afar has been made through prophecies in terms more or less explicit, more or less clear. They were meant to encourage men's hopes for the future, and once those hopes were realized, once God presented men with His Son made Man, those prophecies became a sign.

But there was another way for Providence to prepare men for Christ and for His Church. It was to form in history rough models of the great things to come; it was to insert in history sketches or figures, sometimes clear and sometimes veiled, of the wonderful realities which, one day, would be proposed to men.

Now that Christ has come and founded His Church, now that we have before our eyes the reality, we can see how these figures and types have prepared the way. We can mark out the successive approximations and images in sacred history which have been put there to prepare the minds and hearts of men. We can now understand how all these things are tied together in the history of salvation. The Old Testament contains in germ all that would appear on the great day of final revelation: "Novum Testamentum in Vetere latet; Vetus Testamentum in Novo patet!"

Yet the past generation of Bible scholars have, understandably, not devoted themselves to a study of this "typical sense," but rather

[5] *Col.*, 2:17.
[6] *Heb.*, 8:5.
[7] *I Peter*, 3:21.

to problems in the historical and literal order. The whole subject seemed quite vague, and even dangerous, and hardly suited to the cold examination of the scientific method. It seemed of interest only to the poet or mystic—and perhaps a florid Lenten preacher in search of metaphors. But now the typical sense is no longer neglected. Coppens and Danielou are among the growing number of Catholic scholars who are putting new value on typology, and by doing so they are returning to the ancient tradition of the Church.

Saint Paul was certainly prepared to find a meeting place between the institutions and characters of the Old Testament and the realities of the New. He underlined the importance of types when he compared the role played in the history of man by Adam with that played by Our Lord. Adam, the source of man's physical life, was an image of Christ, the source of man's supernatural life.

The notion of the mutual dependance of various parts of the Scripture was deeply rooted in the minds of the first Christian writers. They developed the views of the New Testament on types for some very practical reasons. The needs of teaching the deep mysteries of faith and of preaching to the people made it a necessity.

Then, too, the early church was founded among Jewish communities who were used to the lessons of their synagogue. It was only natural that the sacred books played a great part in the early Christian gatherings. And it was to be expected that the Old Testament remained the theme of these services on which they developed their evangelical preaching. A good example of this in the technique of an early convert instruction is the way the Deacon Philip spoke to the eunuch as they drove along in the chariot.

The early liturgy, such as the Holy Saturday Vigil and the beautiful preparatory instructions for Baptism, was full of forms and figures of the Old Law. The Old Testament continued to play a role of great importance in the religious, intellectual, and moral formation of the faithful. And all of this implied an exegesis which was not content with a simple literal exposition, but which sought to bring from the text the examples, the lessons, the "types," which would strengthen the faith of the hearers, and form their moral conscience.

The attempts of Marcionism to separate completely the two economies of salvation only resulted in stressing the solidarity and

unity between them. All the refutations of this heresy, from Justine to Tertullian, suppose this. These men went to the Old Testament for the source of their apologetics as well as for the source of their spiritual life (which Pope Pius XII would recommend so many centuries later in the *Divino Afflante Spiritu*).

But strange and tragic exaggerations began to appear. Out of the East rose "allegorism." It was a strange cloak of fantasy and imagination which soon covered the entire Old Testament in its overly lush folds. Every tiny detail soon had a figurative meaning; every unimportant event in Old Testament history suddenly had a corresponding event in the New. The leaders of this new school were certainly not guided in their search for figures and types by the solid and safe example of Christ, the Evangelists, or the Apostles.

Allegorism reigned in Alexandria, but sent out its extravagant disciples in all directions. Since the time of Philon, a contemporary of Christ, this Egyptian city had allowed its scriptural studies to be blinded by an over-active imagination. The great Origen strongly supported this exotic tradition when he says in one of his homelies: "The carnal sense is nothing; the spiritual sense is all." He forgot that the latter is founded on the "carnal" sense!

This trend had a great influence in the West until the Renaissance and the Humanism of the sixteenth century. During the Middle Ages many European writers viewed the Old Testament in a highly mystical, and even fantastic, light.

But in the East there soon developed a live opposition to allegorism. There was a healthy reaction which was able to emphasize the difference between the allegoric interpretation and the legitimate typological interpretation. Even a man like Theodore of Mopsuestia, while avoiding the exaggerations of Origen, knew that it was not for nothing that Christ compared himself to Jonas, that John the Baptist salutes Our Lord as the Lamb who takes away our sins, that Saint Paul sees the Savior as the second Adam.

While it is true that the great work of the exegete is to know as well as possible the literal sense, he also has the obligation to find in the Old Testament all those things and people who prepare, announce, and prefigure the new economy of salvation. But there must be prudence in the discovery and exploitation of types. There must be more than a mere similarity or a "lucky meeting" of words. He must be guided by the New Testament authors.

There is a "typical" sense. This association of ideas is willed by the principal author of both parts of the Bible, God Himself. But it presents as its first principle the conservation of the literal sense. We must learn to say with Origen: "We who belong to the Catholic Church do not despise the Law of Moses, but accept it, so long as it is Jesus who interprets it for us." As de Lubac says: "Indeed what we call nowadays the Old and New Testaments is not primarily a book. It is a twofold event, a twofold 'covenant,' a dispensation which unfolds its development through the ages, and which is fixed, one might suppose, by no written account."

For the Fathers, sacred history was a language; it was the word of God, because throughout this history they found a mystery, that of Christ and His Church. Since this mystery is in the process of fulfillment and will not be completed until the very end of time, the New Testament does not contain, any more than the Old, a complete meaning in its literal sense. But it is the Old Testament, beyond the facts and events which the literal meaning of the text teaches us, which also designates "something else," the very reality of which is to come. Its symbols are the "praeparatoria figurativa" of St. Thomas Aquinas.

The whole of the Old Testament is habitually seen by the Fathers as one comprehensive and extensive prophecy, and the subject of the prophecy is no less than the mystery of Christ, which would not be complete were it not also the mystery of the Church. The Old Testament types of Christ and His Church should help us and guide us toward our Savior and His plans for our salvation.

WILLARD F. JABUSCH

Old St. James Church
Chicago, Ill.

DO WE TRUST TOO MUCH TO OUR PARISH SCHOOLS?

The great number of Catholic children in non-Catholic institutions comes as a shock to a good many people when first they learn of it. About three-fifths of all our Catholic children—six out of ten million—are in non-Catholic institutions. This bare statement must arouse us to the realization that, good and worthy as is our Catholic system of schools, very much more needs to be done beyond the limits of our parish school system in order adequately to care for Catholic children of school age in the United States.

As matters are now, the energy and self sacrifice of many thousands of Catholic priests, Sisters, Brothers, and lay teachers are concentrated on the welfare, the instruction, the training of about four million of our Catholic children. To build the schools to accommodate them, the Catholic people have gone to great efforts and are still working tirelessly. In one of our large dioceses it was announced recently that there were two hundred projects for Catholic schools approved by the building committee. To visit the parish schools, the high schools and colleges of the United States, to see the number of their teachers, the accommodations of their classrooms, one would think that everything possible is being done for Catholic children in the United States. Yet there are six million who cannot find a place in the Catholic institutions; many of them must of necessity go to public schools or other secular institutions.

In many cases, and this adds to the problem, the Catholic children who go to non-Catholic institutions are often the ones who receive least instruction and encouragement at home to grow up good and fervent Catholics. This does not mean that many of the Catholic children in public schools are not good and well instructed Catholics. Unquestionably in many instances their parents send them to the public schools because of some difficulty in getting them into the parish school or for some other reasonable cause. Evidently, in many cases, our Catholic schools are filled to their capacity and sometimes fuller than their architects intended. With the best will in the world on the part of everyone concerned, it is

physically impossible for many more Catholic children to enter Catholic schools, under present circumstances. But the fact remains that good Catholic parents will make much more effort to send their children to Catholic schools than will parents with less faith and fervor. Hence there must be far more Catholic children in our Catholic schools who receive instruction and edification at home than among a proportionate number in the public school system.

It may, we think, be said without fear of contradiction that the atmosphere in the public schools, the influences and the incitements are very different from those in Catholic schools. For the most part, under the direction of Sisters and Brothers and, in the higher schools, of priests, the whole atmosphere of the Catholic schools is religious, and helps to piety and morality. While a great number of very worthy and earnest teachers, many of them Catholics in our big cities, are staffing the public school system, still they cannot exercise anything like the influence over their pupils for good and especially for religious fervor of the Catholic schools.

One can hardly expect our Catholic people, under present circumstances, to rise to the occasion of building schools and staffing them so as to accommodate the millions of Catholic children now in the public school system. Even if it were practicable to raise such huge sums of money, it would be impossible to secure sufficient Sisters and Brothers and Catholic laity to teach, as all those who are available are fully occupied in the present Catholic schools.

The religious teaching communities are making every effort to secure more vocations, but without greatly increasing the number of their teaching staff. In some communities indeed the older Sisters are bearing a large part of the task of teaching, and the younger generation is not numerous enough to carry on, still less to expand the teaching work of the community. Large numbers of laymen and laywomen have been called on to assist. Hence, even if it were possible to build enough Catholic schools to take care of the Catholic children, besides the immense cost of building and maintenance, there would have to be an enormous expenditure in salaries. The Sisters and Brothers get along on a minimum salary because they live in a community and according to the spirit of poverty. But lay teachers would have to be paid a living wage, which for them is several times more than the Sisters require. Hence, to provide for the millions more of Catholic children in

our Catholic school system, we would need an annual income for salaries which would be staggering.

What then can be done to meet this very anxious situation? One can hardly doubt that too many of our Catholic children in public institutions fall away from the Faith or become indifferent Catholics. Chaplains in penal institutions where there are a large number of Catholics will sometimes say that a comparatively few inmates are graduates from Catholic schools. So far as we know there are no definite statistics as to what becomes of the Catholic children who have been educated in non-Catholic institutions and the fact that we know so little about this is in itself a misfortune. But few with varied experience, over a long term of years, would doubt that the Catholic graduates of public institutions are in far greater danger of falling away from the Faith or becoming indifferent and unedifying Catholics than those who have received the religious and moral training of Catholic schools. How much the Church loses from the fact that so many of these precious Catholic children are educated in non-religious surroundings and also without proper influence at home, God only knows, but the loss must be very great.

Here is a field for thought and prayer and also for planning which should, one thinks, bring great fruits for Church and for souls, namely the ways and means of giving the Catholic pupils in non-Catholic schools as much encouragement and help as possible to become and remain good Catholics, even under their present circumstances.

When we look at things as they are and consider that less than one-half of our Catholic children are now receiving practically all of the work, solicitude, interest, good influence of so many thousands of devoted Sisters and Brothers and priests, and that so little is being done comparatively to reach and help, strengthen and confirm in their faith and practices the Catholics in non-Catholic schools, does it not seem that there must be some way to detach, so to say, a number at least of the religious who are now giving their whole attention to the Catholic schools and enlist them in the spiritual help of those other Catholic children? That this can be done there is no question, but that it would involve sacrifices and difficulties is equally clear. In some dioceses, effective steps are being taken to employ Sisters in the systematic instruc-

tion of the Catholic children in the public schools. Centers are formed where a little community of Sisters live and radiate to the surrounding districts, teaching catechism and bringing the children together also for recreational activities.

Years ago in 1913, when I was busily laying the foundation for the *Queens Work* and planning the sodality movement, I chanced upon an article in the *New York Times* describing the "Vacation Schools" which at that time were being conducted by some Protestant denominations in and around New York. It was a new idea and from the article it was clear that the children who were being attracted to these centers and taught Bible lessons were in a great part the poor Catholic children in the underprivileged neighborhoods.

So I prepared an article on Vacation Schools and published it in the first issue of the *Queens Work,* suggesting that these Catholic children be cared for by those of their own faith. This was, so far as I know, the first article that appeared in a Catholic periodical on this subject and the suggestion was taken up by various groups who laid the beginnings of the extensive system of Catholic Vacation Schools which now exists in the United States.

Other efforts have been made and are being made to reach and to give religious instruction to the Catholic children in public schools. But a vast deal still remains to be done and while these summer schools are good and helpful, they do not take the place of the year long instruction and influence.

The released-time plan has also done a great deal of good and has great possibilities, but it is hardly enough.

Until now too many Catholics have looked on the public school system as something apart and afar from their interests and responsibilities. Priests and Sisters who are so much occupied with necessary duties and activities feel that they have no call to care for the Catholic children in the public schools, except perhaps through such activities as we have already mentioned. In discussing the relative conditions in the Catholic and the public schools they are naturally inclined to be happy about the good influence of the Catholic schools and the relative good conduct of their pupils, without perhaps reflecting that whatever happens in the public schools for good is a benefit to the Church because it affects so many

Catholic children; and that the shortcomings and faults of the public school system are equally harmful, because they unfavorably affect so many of our precious young ones.

Merely to call attention to this situation is, we think, a service. To work out a solution is a matter of local conditions, local authority. What we have said is not in criticism, but by way of suggestion and emphasis. In some Catholic schools it may be possible to have events to which the Catholic students in the public schools are especially invited. In the parishes, special retreats and other exercises for the public school children are now given in some instances, but they could be greatly multiplied. The system of the Newman Clubs which is widespread in non-Catholic institutions offers, of course, a great opportunity for coming in contact with Catholic students and helping them religiously.

The great difficulty in utilizing all these opportunities is that of man-power or woman-power. Here again, as in so many problems of the Church, we need to be reminded of the great reservoir of energy and zeal which is to be found among the competent Catholic lay folk. Even now the teachers in the public schools are doing a good deal to meet the problem, but with organization and system they might do a great deal more. In every parish there are some men and women who have, even in this busy age, some hours a week that they could give to the interest of the public school children. It would be a work full of blessings and fruitfulness for the children, for themselves and for the Church.

EDWARD F. GARESCHÉ, S.J.

Sylva Maria
Framingham, Mass.

THE EUCHARISTIC FAST

In everyday life, various points concerning the Eucharistic fast as well as the evening Mass present themselves for solution. In listing some of them and offering a solution, the common opinion is presented as expressed by Matthaeus a Coronata in his article in the *Jus Seraphicum* (1958), pp. 543 ff.

The Eucharistic fast now in force permits any food or drink, not excluding alcoholic drink even hard liquor, up to three hours before the celebration of Mass or the reception of Holy Communion. It permits liquids, but not alcoholic drink, up to one hour before the celebration of Mass or the reception of Holy Communion. The infirm may take non-alcoholic drink as well as liquid or solid medicine any time before the celebration of Mass or the reception of Holy Communion. Water does not break the Eucharistic fast.

1. *Natural fast and Eucharistic fast.*

The natural fast of Canon 808 is abrogated. This follows from the fact that the drinking of water no longer breaks the fast. In place of the natural fast we have a Eucharistic fast which varies according to the norms indicated.

2. *Water.*

The drinking of water no longer breaks the Eucharistic fast at any time. By water is meant water without anything added, thus one may not add sugar to water. However, if water from its source contains a small quantity of minerals, such as calcium or iron, or if something is added to the water supply by public authority, as fluoride or chlorine, the water is permitted. In short, whatever is considered as water in the common estimation of men is permitted, including carbonated water or mineral waters. "Needless to say, lemonade, orangeade, etc. which are sometimes called mineral waters in English, are not included." (W. Conway, *The Irish Eccl. Record,* 1957, p. 375.)

3. *Drink.*

The drink permitted up to one hour before Mass or Holy Communion, or in the case of the infirm with no time limit, means anything that is liquid or fluid when put into one's mouth so that it

may be swallowed without first chewing it. Such drink may be nourishing, or it may satisfy thirst, or it may give one a lift. It includes liquids in which solids such as sugar are added and dissolved, or are still in suspension. Such permissible liquids are milk, broth, liquid chocolate, tea, coffee, eggnog, lemonade, fruit juices, and the like.

4. *Time.*

The three hours abstinence from solid food and alcoholic drink, and the one hour abstinence from non-alcoholic drink before Mass and Holy Communion include the following:

For celebrating Mass, the time is reckoned from the beginning of the Mass, that is, when the priest at the foot of the altar signs himself with the sign of the cross saying: *"In nomine Patris,"* etc. In Masses which are preceded by some function which supplants the prayers at the foot of the altar as the blessing of the palms, or the ceremonies before Mass at the Paschal Vigil, the beginning of the Mass is not the beginning of the ceremonies before Mass, but the first words of the Introit.

For receiving Holy Communion, the three hours time and the one hour respectively are figured from the time the individual receives the Sacred Host, and no longer from the time when the priest begins to distribute Holy Communion.

The three hours time and the one hour must be computed strictly. The one hour must be sixty minutes and the three hours a total of 180 minutes, with not one minute lacking.

5. *Alcoholic Drink.*

Alcoholic drink of whatever kind within three hours before the celebration of Mass and the reception of Holy Communion is by all means and absolutely forbidden both to priests and the faithful. The same holds for the infirm.

Alcoholic drink includes all drink containing alcohol in whatever quantity or percentage, e.g. beer, wine, whiskey, mixed drinks, etc. A distinction is no longer made between alcoholic beverages and hard liquor in the present law of the Eucharistic fast.

6. *Infirm.*

The infirm are those wanting in health. The infirmity may be grave or light, long or short, even of one day or less, as a headache

or toothache of a few hours. All persons in ill health because of old age or other cause, women indisposed because of pregnancy, are included among the infirm. They also are included among the infirm who are convalescing for a certain time from a grave illness or a serious operation.

They are included among the infirm who get sea sick, air sick, or sick when riding a train or car; such may take liquid or solid medicine without restriction of time before Mass or Holy Communion in order to forestall such sickness. The same holds for one suffering from laryngitis, such a one may even a few minutes before the celebration of Mass or receiving Holy Communion relieve the soreness by sucking lozenges, or the equivalent.

It is clear that one need not be confined to bed or even to the house in order to be included among the infirm. Moreover, since the legislator does not use the word *aegrotus,* but that having a wider meaning *infirmus,* one must not depart from the wider meaning of this word *infirmus;* for instance, he who has a headache or toothache for a few hours is not *aegrotus* but he is *infirmus.*

The infirm may take non-alcoholic drink as well as liquid or solid medicine before the celebration of Mass or Holy Communion without any time limit whatever, just as with water.

7. *Medicine.*

Medicine is a liquid or a solid substance which is taken to heal sickness, to alleviate its ill effects, as also to prevent a crisis in sickness. If it is prescribed by a doctor, it certainly is medicine; but this last point is by no means necessary. It suffices that a certain substance is considered medicine in the common estimation of men. Also, it does not matter that the medicine may at the same time be nourishing, although it is also true that not every solid substance taken as nourishment may be considered medicine. There is a great difference between medicine which at the same time nourishes and some solid substance which is taken for nourishment. For medicine, of its very nature, is intended to heal, while solid food first and directly rebuilds strength. So a medicine which at the same time nourishes does so indirectly and by accident. Likewise also a solid substance taken as nourishment may in the end heal some weakness. The criterion is: medicine which is lawfully taken by the infirm with no time limit before Mass or Holy Com-

munion is either liquid or solid substances which according to medical science or the common estimation of men of its very nature is taken *to heal.* Wherefore, steak which of its very nature nourishes and strengthens, although prescribed by a doctor to build up blood, is only food and not medicine.

The question arises whether medicine containing alcohol is permitted the infirm without any time limit before Mass or Holy Communion.

Some taught that the use of medicine containing alcohol is not forbidden the infirm because neither the Constitution *Christus Dominus* nor the Instruction which followed, when speaking of medicine, distinguished in any way regarding the elements of which medicine is made. According to others, however, medicine containing alcohol was said to be forbidden by all means.

However, since the *Sacram Communionem* almost all the authors agree in admitting the opinion which holds that medicine which also contains alcohol does *not* break the Eucharistic fast for the infirm.

8. *Those in Danger of Death.*

As in the past, so also under the present Eucharistic legislation, it is certain that alcoholic drink including hard liquor, and solid food, just as ordinary drink, medicine and water are not forbidden those infirm (and others) who are in danger of death, and who may receive Holy Communion daily as Viaticum; for Holy Communion received as Viaticum is not subject to the law of the Eucharistic fast. This portion of Canon 858, par. 1 *"nisi mortis urgeat periculum, aut necessitas impediendi irreverentiam in sacramentum"* remains in full force at the present time.

9. *The Choice of Observing the Former Law of the Eucharistic Fast.*

In granting the very generous mitigation of the Eucharistic fast, His Holiness Pope Pius XII strongly exhorted both priests and faithful, who can do so, to observe the venerable and old form of the Eucharistic fast before Mass and Holy Communion.

The question is, in view of this exhortation, is it possible for anyone to ignore entirely the new law of the *Sacram Communionem* and live solely according to the older law in the matter of the Eucharistic fast?

The answer is no. In at least two points the *Sacram Communionem* made the Eucharistic law stricter, and everyone must observe these two points where they apply:

(1) Masses offered at midnight or in the first hours of the morning as well as Holy Communion at midnight or the first hours of the morning must also be preceded by the three hour and one hour abstinence from food and drink respectively as prescribed in the *Sacram Communionem.*

(2) In Canon Law, Canon 858, pargh. 2, under the conditions specified, the infirm without limit of time were allowed drink not excluding alcoholic drink. Now they are allowed drink under more generous conditions but all alcoholic drink is forbidden in the concession (apart from that medicine which also contains alcohol, according to most authors).

10. *The Ablution at Bination and Trination Masses.*

The ablution may be taken at the first and second Masses, but only water. If through inadvertence wine is taken at the ablution in the first and second Masses, the priest may celebrate the second and third Mass without being obliged to ask another priest who is perhaps still fasting to take his place.

On Christmas and All Souls Day, if the Masses are said without interruption, the rubrics are to be followed, that is, no ablution in the first two Masses. If, nevertheless, one does take water at the ablution in the first two Masses, one may still say the second and third Mass, because water does not break the Eucharistic fast. Presupposing no contempt, there is no question of serious sin in the violation of this rubric, because the rubric does not intend to oblige gravely.

What is the state of the question if in violating this rubric with an ablution, there is also a conscious violation of the Eucharistic fast in taking not only water but also wine for the ablution in the first and second Masses. In thus taking wine at the ablution, the law of the Eucharistic fast is violated, and therefore the second and third Masses may no longer be celebrated lawfully within the three thour limit. Moreover, one may not apply the exception recognized in the Instruction for the case in which wine is taken inadvertently at the ablution. For this exception is only for the case in which the priest *is obliged* to celebrate a second or third

Mass, which generally is not verified when three Masses are offered in succession as when said out of devotion.

Here Matthaeus a Coronata comments on the word *debeat:* "is obliged." He says that although we understand the word *debeat* as a true obligation, it must be taken in a wide sense. One not only celebrates two or three Masses out of obligation who uses an apostolic indult or a faculty granted by the local ordinary, in favor of a notable part of the faithful who otherwise could not attend Mass on a day of obligation (can. 806) but also he who does so by command of the superior or pastor, so that, for example, a Mass stipend may be satisfied that day or even that hour, or that an opportunity be given to those accustomed to come to the church of hearing Mass. Apart from the command of the superior or pastor, this priest would have said only one Mass.

When two or three Masses are spaced so that more than three hours intervene between any two Masses, the common opinion holds that in virtue of the *Sacram Communionem* it is of obligation that (if the ablution is taken at the first of the two Masses) the ablution must be both water and wine—wine being allowed more than three hours before Mass.

11. *The Hour for Holy Communion.*

Canon 867 says in part that Holy Communion may be distributed only during those hours in which Mass may be offered. Those hours are according to Canon 821 from one hour before dawn up to one hour after noon. These are the hours when without restriction Mass may be offered and Holy Communion distributed.

Some there are who mistakenly try to apply the same norm to the evening hours when the bishop may allow evening Mass. The evening hours during which the bishop may allow evening Mass cannot be classified correctly among the hours spoken of by Canon 867 "in which Mass may be offered," because during the said hours evening Masses are *forbidden,* not permitted, unless by a special faculty of the bishop of the diocese. And when evening Mass is permitted, Holy Communion is specifically limited by the Holy See to the Communion during the Mass itself, just before the Mass or immediately after that Mass. A distribution of Holy Communion which is independent of the evening Mass is forbidden.

The same holds true regarding the evening hours during which the bishop may in virtue of the faculty of March 21, 1960 allow Holy Communion to be distributed under the same conditions as at the evening Mass in connection with the public devotions which he specifies. A distribution of Holy Communion which is independent of these specified evening devotions is forbidden.

Therefore, even on days when the bishop grants permission for evening Mass with its special opportunity to receive Holy Communion as indicated, the ordinary hours for distributing Holy Communion are the hours in which Mass may be offered, namely, from one hour before dawn up to one hour after noon.

Added to this general norm, Canon 867, par. 4 makes provision for a case occurring rarely, namely, Holy Communion is to be distributed only during the hours indicated, "unless a reasonable cause urges otherwise: *nisi aliud rationabilis causa suadeat.*"

For example, this provision of Canon 867 was used by a priest who once each Lent made a special trip to hear the confessions of workers speaking a foreign language. He heard their confessions at three o'clock in the afternoon. Immediately after hearing the confessions of this group, he distributed Holy Communion to them. This was in the days when these men were obliged to observe the natural fast from the preceding midnight in order to receive Holy Communion.

Such special cases for distributing Holy Communion as provided for by Canon 867, par. 4 are applicable at any time in the afternoon, evening or night. The Holy Office in its decision of March 21, 1960 states that this clause *"nisi aliud rationabilis causa suadeat"* has not been abrogated, though with the mitigation of the Eucharistic fast such a reasonable cause will occur more rarely now than formerly.

Wherefore, for any reasonable, even though not grave cause, Holy Communion may be distributed outside the hours appointed for the distribution of Holy Communion. To distribute Holy Communion in the afternoon, evening or night without any reasonable cause at all is a venial sin for the priest doing so. (Capello and Matthaeus a Coronata.)

A reasonable cause is an inconvenience of any moment, a greater convenience, devotion, undertaking a journey, etc. The reasonable

cause can be on the part of the communicant or on the part of the priest distributing Holy Communion. Capello indicates that the reasonable cause must be greater, the earlier before dawn or the later after noon Holy Communion is distributed in this way.

And Madden writes (*Australian Catholic Record* [1957], p. 317): "Since canon 867 still remains in force, a reasonable cause will justify a priest who wishes to give Holy Communion during the afternoon apart from Mass. Some special circumstances would be needed, perhaps more serious than when a fast from midnight was obligatory. The fact that a man had fasted till the afternoon hours in order to receive Communion was already a good argument that he had a reason for wishing to communicate on that particular day. With only a three hours' fast from solids and one from liquids, he has not suffered such inconvenience to attain his desire. However, individual cases which merit consideration can still arise."

12. *Evening Mass.*

(1) *Who may permit evening Mass?*

The local ordinary may permit evening Mass. Since this is ordinary power, he can delegate his power of granting such faculties. The vicar general needs a special mandate from his bishop to grant permission for evening Mass.

Since the major superiors in clerical exempt Religious Orders are not local ordinaries, they cannot grant permission for evening Mass, not even in their interior oratories.

A military ordinary may grant permission for evening Mass within the sphere of his jurisdiction.

The competent local ordinary for granting permission for evening Mass on a ship is the ordinary of the place in whose territory lies the port in which the ship is usually berthed.

(2) *Is a grave necessity required for the local ordinary to permit evening Mass?*

No, a grave necessity is not required. The original grant in the *Christus Dominus* made mention of necessity being required, but even then the necessity was interpreted in a wide sense as meaning rather a certain reasonable convenience. The new grant in the *Sacram Communionem* drops the reference to necessity and in-

stead uses the words "if the spiritual welfare of a notable part of the faithful requires it."

(3) *Does the faculty to grant permission for evening Mass apply both to weekdays as well as to Sundays and Holydays of obligation?*

The Holy See makes no distinction between evening Masses on weekdays and those on Sundays and Holydays of obligation. The norms apply to both kind of evening Masses. If a distinction is made, it would give a special emphasis to the evening Masses on Sundays and Holydays of obligation as arising from the fact that at the beginning of the *Sacram Communionem* the Sovereign Pontiff proposes this to himself as a reason for evening Masses, namely, in order to make it easier for the faithful to satisfy the precept of attending Mass on Sundays and Holydays of obligation.

(4) *When is the clause verified "if the spiritual welfare of a notable part of the faithful requires it"?*

A notable part of the faithful would be had if some twenty persons are concerned. This is based on the analogy with the interpretation of Canon 806 where the term "a notable part of the faithful" is used in reference to the local ordinary granting the faculty to binate. In granting permission for evening Mass for a notable part of the faithful, necessity is not required but only a reason that is conducive to their spiritual welfare.

(5) *On what days may the local ordinary permit evening Mass?*

Every day. The *Christus Dominus* had allowed it only on specified days. At the request of the bishops, Pope Pius XII extended this in the *Sacram Communionem* and granted the local ordinaries the faculty to permit evening Mass every day. He uses the word *quotidie.*

(6) *May permission for evening Mass be presumed at times?*

It is admitted that the faculty or permission to binate may be presumed at times, if, namely, a real and grave necessity is present and recourse to the local ordinary to obtain permission is impossible. With this twofold condition present, the presumption is reasonable and suffices. From an analogy with bination permitted in the case when the spiritual welfare of a notable part of the faithful requires it, some authors teach that permission may be presumed to celebrate evening Mass.

(7) *Whether in one and the same place and on the same day more than one evening Mass may be celebrated?*

The answer is yes. The local ordinary may permit more than one evening Mass on the same day, either in the same or different churches, either in the same or at different hours.

(8) *Where may evening Mass be celebrated?*

Evening Mass may be celebrated in the same places where under the same conditions morning Mass may be celebrated, namely, in churches, public and semi-public oratories (also on ships), and *servatis servandis* in the open air, if the spiritual welfare of a notable part of the faithful as already explained requires it.

A private oratory may not have evening Mass, that is, if it is erected in a private house for the exclusive benefit of some family or of a private individual.

(9) *May evening Mass be permitted for some private reason?*

The answer is no. The evening Mass is permitted for the spiritual welfare of a notable part of the faithful. This is generally equal to some public good. Evening Mass, then, may not be permitted for the benefit of some private person, as a wedding or a funeral of a *private* person. Here the word private is stressed in contradistinction to some public person as a mayor, or governor, etc., in which case there is a public cause and permission may be granted.

From what has been said, it does not follow that every private ceremony or private celebration is forbidden at an evening Mass, as the first Communion of one person, a marriage of a private couple, a First Mass. Here evening Mass is permitted for the benefit of the faithful, and *at this public evening Mass* some private ceremony may take place. The permission for the evening Mass is given not because of the private ceremony; this is something merely accidental. For example, with the permission of the local ordinary many parishes have an evening Mass on all First Fridays. There is nothing forbidding the pastor to arrange a wedding, the First Communion of an individual, or a First Mass at such an evening Mass.

(10) *What is the earliest time an evening Mass may begin?*

Four o'clock in the afternoon, that is, excepting Good Friday and Holy Saturday.

The Mass on Holy Thursday is in the evening, at an hour more opportune, not however, before four o'clock nor later than nine o'clock.

The Liturgical Action on Good Friday is to be held about three o'clock in the afternoon; however, if a pastoral reason favors it, the ceremonies may begin at noon or at a later hour, not however, later than nine in the evening.

Regarding the lateness of the hour when evening Mass may begin, nothing is determined in the pontifical documents on the new legislation. Since an evening hour must be distinguished from a nocturnal hour, it seems that the latest an evening Mass may begin is up to the first or second hour after sunset. Huerth teaches: "The celebration of Mass may be held as lawful at any hour which according to a sane and reasonable judgment is evening—taking into account our present mode of living according to which also an hour quite late is still classed as belonging to the day or evening. Nevertheless, no one would say that a Mass begun at midnight or shortly before is an evening Mass; it is a nocturnal Mass."

(11) *Regarding the hour of the Paschal Vigil.*

(a) The competent hour is about midnight between Holy Saturday and Easter Sunday.

(b) For reasons of the faithful or considerations of the place, the local ordinary may permit the anticipation of the Paschal Vigil, but not before twilight on Holy Saturday, or certainly not before sunset.

(c) General permission to anticipate the Paschal Vigil may not be given to a whole diocese or region, but only for places and churches where true necessity exists. Moreover, let the competent hour of about midnight be observed at least in the cathedral, and in all other churches, especially religious, which can do so without grave inconvenience.

(12) *Fulfilling the precept of hearing Mass in the evening.*

Speaking of evening Mass on Sundays and Holydays of obligation, anyone assisting at such a Mass fulfills his obligation of hearing Mass that day. This certainly holds for persons for whom the evening Mass is permitted, and also for all the other faithful who actually assist at it. This, indeed, is not clearly stated in the official documents, but it is admitted by common teaching and interpreta-

tion, with no one dissenting. This holds true even if the faithful could easily have attended Mass in the morning, but deliberately chose to go in the evening.

Whence it follows that the faithful who cannot attend Mass in in the morning are bound to do so in the evening if they are not excused because of grave inconvenience.

(13) *Has the introduction of the new legislation on evening Mass abrogated the privilege of celebrating Mass as late as three o'clock in the afternoon?*

The answer is no. Matthaeus a Coronata in his *Institutiones* (Vol. I, fourth edition, number 61 bis in a note), as well as Capobianco, O.F.M. (*Privilegia et Facultates O.F.M.* Romae [1956], n. 64 ff.) speak of the privilege some religious have had for centuries to begin Mass as late as three o'clock in the afternoon. This privilege is practical at times when one is unduly delayed in traveling. Since this privilege in no way contradicts the new legislation on evening Mass, it is by no means abrogated by the new documents of the Holy See; neither is it necessary, as is evident, to have the consent of the local ordinary in order to use this privilege.

ADRIAN HOLZMEISTER, O.F.M.CAP.

St. Francis Friary
Providence, R. I.

Answers to Questions

FUNERALS OF INFANTS

Question: Have funerals for Catholic infants fallen into desuetude? Funeral directors simply ask for a certificate and promptly inter the body in a Catholic cemetery.

Answer: The *Rituale Romanum* still carries a seven-page section entitled *"Ordo Sepeliendi Parvulos"* (*Titulus* VI, *C. 7*, ed. 1945) which furnishes a beautiful ceremony that would bring much consolation to the grieving parents if they had an opportunity to follow it in translation. Here is a chance for the pastor to bring back to its rightful place in the liturgical life of his parish a ceremony that has been lost in the hustle and bustle of modern living. In the ceremony as given by the Ritual there is no Mass prescribed, but it is allowed and is laudable. It may be either the Mass of the day or a votive Mass of the Angels with or without any special privileges over the ordinary votive Mass.

ONE SERVER FOR MULTIPLE MASSES

Question: Is there any restriction on the number of Masses a lone server may serve simultaneously, or does the canon specify *"solus cum sola"?*

Answer: The Code says only that a priest should not celebrate Mass without a minister to serve him and make the responses. However, the dignity and reverence due to the Mass would seem to require a decent limit to the number of Masses served by the same minister. Practical difficulties will add further limitations if the Masses in question are to proceed without interruption, as they should.

EMBER DAY RUBRIC

Question: On the Wednesday and Saturday of the Ember Days, does the celebrant say the *Kyrie* at the Epistle side or does he say it at the center and then return to the Epistle side for the *Oremus?*

Answer: The *Ritus servandus in celebratione Missae* (V, 4) directs the celebrant to go to the center for the *Kyrie* and return to the Epistle side for the *Oremus.*

THE EPISTLE OF A MISSA CANTATA

Question: Does the celebrant of a High Mass read or sing the Epistle?

Answer: If there is a server who is at least tonsured, he would sing the Epistle. Otherwise, the celebrant may read it or sing it. After Jan. 1, 1961, if a minister sings the Epistle, the celebrant will omit it.

SS. COSMAS AND DAMIAN IN LENT

Question: On Thursday after the Third Sunday of Lent the Oration of the Mass proper to that day mentions the *"beata solemnitas"* of Saints Cosmas and Damian. These martyrs are named also in the Post-communion. The Station appointed for the aforesaid Thursday is, indeed, that of Saints Cosmas and Damian. But why, may I ask, the *"beata solemnitas,"* since the Mass is ferial and the Saints' feast day is September 27th?

Answer: Cardinal Schuster, in *The Sacramentary,* II, p. 105, says: "The Greeks were in the habit of celebrating a day of festival in honour of the holy cross in the middle of Lent, making a break, as it were, in the long period of fasting. In Rome this solemnity is deferred to the Sunday following, but Gregory II instituted this station at the Church of SS. Cosmas and Damian, in order not altogether to deprive the faithful of that innocent satisfaction in the very middle of Lent. The two martyrs are known as 'Anargyri' (moneyless)—that is, they belonged to that class of Byzantine doctors who despised money and gave their healing services gratis. Moreover, considering the rigour of the Lenten fast in those days, it is easy to understand that many persons must have needed recourse to these heavenly physicians. The Mass has been adapted to the occasion; it refers chiefly to the anniversary of their martyrdom, and the frequent mention of health, sickness, and healing recalls the great popularity of the veneration paid to the holy Anargyri in those early days." Apparently, then, the *"solemnitas"* formerly surrounding the holy cross in the middle of Lent is somewhat confusedly transferred to Saints Cosmas and Damian.

JOHN P. MCCORMICK, S.S.

PREMARITAL INSTRUCTION OF A NON-CATHOLIC

Question: If a priest is giving premarital instructions to a non-Catholic planning to marry a Catholic should he content himself with only instructing him or should he try to convince the person of the truth of the Catholic faith?

Answer: A priest should desire to convert to the Catholic Church every non-Catholic with whom he comes in contact, because he wishes all men to share in the happiness and the security of the one true faith. This is particularly true when he is imparting to this person instructions in Catholic doctrine, which are so intimately connected with arguments in support of the Catholic faith. At the same time, prudence may suggest that in giving premarital instructions the priest will sometimes abstain from any direct efforts to convince the recipient of the truth of Catholic doctrine. It must be remembered that the chief purpose of the premarital instruction of a non-Catholic about to marry a Catholic (prescribed by some bishops) is to enlighten the non-Catholic about the teachings of the Catholic Church, so that he will understand the beliefs and the practices of his future spouse and thus they will enjoy a more harmonious home life. I would, generally speaking, suggest that unless the non-Catholic manifest a positive (even though only probable) inclination to join the Catholic Church, the priest will do better if he merely explains Catholic teachings without any attempt to lead the person to conversion. Otherwise, he may stir up in the non-Catholic a defense attitude against what he regards as unjustifiable proselytizing and render him antagonistic to the Church. If the priest succeeds in showing the non-Catholic how eminently logical is the Catholic position, he will have gone a great way. The seeds of conversion will have been sown, and divine grace may produce the fruits at a considerably later time.

DETERMINING THE SEX OF OFFSPRING

Question: A scientist recently told me of a method which might be used to determine the sex of future offspring. He said that in the normal seminal ejaculate, some of the spermatazoa will produce only a male and the others only a female. Moreover, he claimed, the two types can be microscopically discerned. Now, if the sper-

matazoa for the undesired sex could be prevented from entering the uterus after intercourse or chemically sterilized, the only offspring that could result would be of the sex which the couple would wish. What is to be said of such a procedure?

Answer: I am not competent to speak of the biological aspect of this procedure, and so, I shall consider only the moral aspect. I believe that the basic problem from this standpoint concerns the nature of the act which by divine law a married man must attempt to perform when he makes use of his conjugal rights—namely, whether he must try to place *all* the semen in the vagina of his wife so that it can enter the uterus, or whether he may directly keep *some* of the semen from entering the vagina or uterus. There seem to be two schools of thought among Catholic theologians about this matter. Some believe that the man fulfills the divine law if he deposits *some* of the semen in the vagina, or removes some immediately after it is deposited so that it is not sinful (given sufficient reason) by deliberate intent to prevent the rest of the semen from entering the vagina or uterus. This is the principle underlying such practices as the use of a perforated condom to obtain semen for examination and the removal of some semen from the vagina immediately after intercourse for the same purpose. The argument of these theologians is that the man performs the act *substantially* when he deposits some of the semen (some say the most of it) in the place intended by God's law, even though the rest of it is deliberately deposited elsewhere. It would seem that these theologians would logically agree to the morality of the procedure described, because in the experiment some of the semen (that containing the spermatazoa calculated to generate a child of the desired sex) is deposited and allowed to enter the uterus, although the rest of it is deliberately prevented from entering the uterus or chemically sterilized.

Other theologians, however, believe that the sex act is not performed properly in accordance with God's law if *any* of the semen is *directly* prevented from entering the vagina or uterus or deliberately deprived of its efficacy. The word *directly* is important in this connection, for there are times when a man may permit the depositing of some semen outside the vagina as an *indirect* effect of his semination, justifiable by the fact that some of the

semen is deposited in the proper place and he does not intend the inevitable loss of the rest. For example, because of some physical defect a man may involuntarily deposit a portion of the semen outside the vagina, but the rest of it reaches its proper place. Again, a hypospadiac may use a perforated condom to facilitate intercourse, even though some portion of the semen is not properly deposited but remains in the condom, for the loss of this semen is not intended but only permitted, and thus the conditions for the principle of the double effect are fulfilled. But these cases are very different from the case when the withholding or destruction of some semen is *directly* willed, as in the procedure described above for the purpose of determining beforehand the sex of a child. I myself favor the second opinion, though I believe the controversy will not be settled until the Church gives a decision.

So much for the problem of determining the sex of offspring by a particular method. What is to be said of the more general question of attempting to generate offspring of the sex desired by the parents through other methods which do not involve any direct tampering with the sexual process—for example, through the use of certain types of food by the parents? I do not believe that this can be considered immoral in itself; but I believe that if such methods proved successful and became widespread, the world would encounter grave sociological problems. For there would doubtless be great inequality of proportion between boys and girls born into the world, at least in some countries, with the result that many would find it difficult to find a partner for marriage. From the beginning of the human race Divine Providence has wonderfully arranged the proper proportion of the sexes, and it is best for men to leave it to God to make the decision as to the numbers of each sex required for the best interests of mankind.

It might be well to add that we have been concerned with *determining* the sex of future offspring in the sense of using effective means whereby the child to be conceived will be either a boy or a girl in accordance with the choice of the parents. The word *determine* could also be used in reference to some means whereby the sex of a child already conceived can be *found out* while it is still in the womb. There would be no sin involved in a process of this kind, as long as there is assurance that no harm will come to mother or child.

CONDITIONS FOR AN INDULGENCE

Question: A person wishes to gain on the same day several plenary indulgences, all of them requiring the fulfillment of the usual conditions (*suetis conditionibus*), among which are a visit to a church and prayer for the intention of the Holy Father. In order to gain all these indulgences, is it sufficient to visit a church only once and to pray only once for the intention of the Pope?

Answer: Canon 933 prescribes that several indulgences cannot be gained by one and the same work, to which indulgences are annexed by several titles, unless the required work is confession and Holy Communion or unless the opposite is expressly stipulated. (An example of this latter exception is the recitation of a rosary to which indulgences by several titles have been affixed). The case is not quite the same as that presented by our questioner. The Code speaks of *one and the same work* indulgenced under several titles. He is speaking of *several* different indulgenced works requiring the same conditions for the gaining of each indulgence—the so-called "usual conditions," which are confession, Holy Communion, a visit to a church or public oratory and prayer for the intention of the Holy Father (Cf. *Preces et pia opera,* praenotanda, 4). But we can surely argue *a pari,* or even *a fortiori,* that if the conditions must be repeated for each indulgence affixed to the same work (except confession and Holy Communion) they must surely be repeated (with the same exception) when there is question of different indulgenced works. That means that if a person wishes to gain several plenary indulgences by different works, each of which requires the "usual conditions" he must make several distinct visits to a church or a public oratory (or a semi-public oratory, if he has there the right to satisfy his obligation of hearing Mass—Can. 929). In the words of Fr. Damen: "If on the same day one wishes to gain several indulgences, each of which requires a visit to a church, he must make as many visits to a church as he wishes to gain indulgences, unless it is otherwise stipulated" (*Theologia moralis,* II, n. 1126). It should be noted, however, that for one legitimately impeded from making a visit to a church or public oratory, a confessor can commute this condition to another good work (Can. 935; Code Commission, Jan. 9, 1940). The visit to the church for the reception of Holy Communion suffices for one of the indulgences (Cf. Regatillo-Zalba, *Theologiae moralis summa,*

III, n. 599). The prayers for the intention of the Holy Father need not be recited on the occasion of the visit to the church, though it is commendable to say them then (*ibid.*, n. 600).

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

An article on "The Development of the Doctrine of the Sacraments" by Fr. J. D. Folghera, O.P., has first place in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for November, 1910. The author narrates the gradual growth of the scientific knowledge of the sacraments in the Church from the early days when the Church expressed her doctrines on the sacraments in her practice rather than in precise formulas, and had very slight consciousness of their specific manner of acting, down through the age of the Fathers and the scholastic era to the Council of Trent, at which the most important doctrines on the sacraments were solemnly defined. . . . Dr. W. McGarvey, himself a convert clergyman, writes on "The Convert Clergyman and the Ecclesiastical Seminary." He recommends the training of convert ministers for the priesthood in seminaries rather than in special houses of study, arguing that in this way the convert becomes more conversant with things Catholic. Describing his own experiences, he says: "Nowhere have I met with anything like the manliness of bearing, the generosity of spirit, the refinement of grace and the kindliness of charity which reign in a Catholic seminary." . . . In the second article of his series on "The Sacred Scriptures on Mixed Marriages," the Very Rev. Peter Meagher, of Singleton, New South Wales, comments on the words of St. Paul in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, beginning with "Bear not the yoke with unbelievers" (6:14—7:1). Fr. Meagher draws the conclusion that "the contracting of a mixed marriage, even with a dispensation, is never fully in accordance with the will of God." . . . Fr. T. Labouré, O.M.I., argues that vasectomy is never permitted as a means of avoiding onanism or as a means of avoiding conception. (This author in a previous issue had held that for a grave good of society the state may inflict a sterilizing operation, even on an innocent person.) . . . The first portion of *Sacrorum antistitum,* the famous Motu proprio of Pope St. Pius X, containing the oath against Modernism, appears in the Analecta. . . . Fr. J. J. Swint (still actively functioning as Archbishop-Bishop of Wheeling) expresses the hope that the United States will one day have a Catholic daily paper.

F. J. C.

Book Reviews

THE SECRET BOOKS OF THE EGYPTIAN GNOSTICS. By Jean Doresse. New York: The Viking Press, 1960. Pp. xvii + 445. $6.50.

Here we have the unusual circumstance whereby two volumes in French (though with a common title) become one in English. General interest in the *Gospel of Thomas* led J. Doresse to follow up his survey (1958) of all the Chenoboskion materials with a specific treatment of the "Thomas" document, in 1959. The gist of the latter publication appears as "Appendix II" (pp. 333-383) of the volume under review.

Things Egyptian and things academic being what they are, it could easily be a long way into the future before any other knowledgeable person is in a position to match Doresse' first hand acquaintance with all of these materials. Published surveys everywhere to date depend in the first instance upon his notes. He sketches the story in the Introduction and in the third chapter of this book. One incidental landmark is "the outbreak of hostilities over the Suez Canal at the end of October [1956]; since which time it has not been possible to put the work of publication upon a sound footing" (p. 124). This was probably written in mid-1957; it will almost certainly still be true as it is reprinted here.

The order chosen for Doresse' treatment involves repetition. A first chapter gives what we knew of Gnosticism, primarily from the early Christian writers, up to recent years. A second describes all the Gnostic treatises in Coptic that were available for study before the Chenoboskion find—three manuscripts and a few fragments, to which are then related some scattered archaeological and epigraphic data; this chapter ends with a general appraisal of Gnosticism borrowed from H. Puech. The fourth chapter is a table of contents of the thirteen codices found, with Doresse' impressions of their paleographical features. The bulk of what the author has to tell, of his own knowledge of the first-hand sources, is in the hundred pages of his fifth chapter. By this point in the volume, the characteristic drivel in which the Gnostic view of the universe was given expression is all too familiar; and Doresse' endeavor to say what he can about as many as possible of the "forty-four secret books" will need selective and repeated reading to yield a balanced view of the whole. The sixth chapter, also rather long, is a preliminary attempt at summing up the principal ideas and sources of this literature—with Greek philosophy, astrology, Egyptian religion, Hermetism, Iranian and Jewish materials, the Qumran folk,

and finally Christianity brought into the discussion; no one can be expected to control all of these factors with equal assurance. Manichean, and other more putative, survivals of Gnosticism, are dealt with in a seventh chapter, and there is an epilogue fervent if not profound.

To those for whom a detailed grasp of the *Gospel of Thomas* is important, Doresse' treatment will not yield as much as the studies of W. Till, J. Fitzmeyer and G. Garitte. Doresse overrates the Christian associations, and the literary and religious significance of the text. The pseudo-Thomas is in fact a dangerous, if somewhat jejune, piece of explicit anti-Christian propaganda. This the discerning reader would be able to verify from the translation and notes, but hardly from Doresse' introduction to it.

The first chapter is rather trying, with its repeated imputations of *parti pris* against the early Christian writers on Gnosticism; one has only to go through the later material in the book to see clearly that Hippolytus, Origen, etc., knew Gnosticism quite well, and described it in its own terms, ludicrous as those are. Among lesser matters, F. de Saulcy's identification of Gomorrah and Qumran is attributable to separate and total deficiencies in understanding the first consonant of these names, in Hebrew on the one hand, and in the Arabic of his Beduin informants on the other. Only by getting them both wrong (before A.D. 1853) could he equate them for M. Doresse (p. 299); C. Clermont-Ganneau made this clear to everybody in 1877. What devil (here the author cannot be at fault) put Dunstan among the Samaritans, p. 15, note 45?

It remains that Doresse' fifth chapter is the substance of what anybody knows to date of the content of all but a handful of these ancient texts.

PATRICK W. SKEHAN

THE SUNDAY SERMONS OF THE GREAT FATHERS, III. From Pentecost to the Tenth Sunday after Pentecost. Translated and edited by M. F. Toal. Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1959. Pp. 379. $4.50.

Fr. Toal's splendid project moves another step toward completion. Again we have in our hands Augustine, John Chrysostom, Origen, Gregory, and those other marvelous spirits of ages long ago. The warmth of their love for the Lord Jesus, the searching of their ardent minds reaches us through their brief recorded words. A taste of an earlier Christianity awakens new possibilities for our own lives—things we have forgotten, a point of view we have never hit upon. Fr. Toal's plan of giving several sermons for each Sunday—and he

gives twelve for Pentecost itself—is an admirable plan: we get a chance to space out our reading through the year, and build up a base of understanding and pointed comment for our Sunday Mass. The Golden Chain of texts from the Fathers which St. Thomas Aquinas once prepared gives readers a sense for the traditional and variant interpretations of the Sunday Scritpure—a good taste of St. Thomas' own preparatory work for his creative thinking.

Art always profits by interpretation, whether it be by "scientific exegesis" or by loving reflection. In the hands of the Fathers, the Word of God receives a wonderful, warm, pedagogic unfolding. The Fathers knew the Word, preached and lived it—spirit perhaps more than letter—and for that reason have life to give us, more than lessons.

Fr. Toal's translations have a pleasing English flavor. The print of the small edition, of course, is tiny. The sermons on the Trinity—to mark a particular value of the selections in this volume—will help the priest who, in our cultured age, finds it difficult to preach the Trinity to his hungry people.

MICHAEL NOVAK

THE MEANING AND MATTER OF HISTORY. By Martin D'Arcy, S.J. New York: Farrar, Straus and Cudahy, 1959. Pp. 309. $5.50.

Father D'Arcy's work on the philosophy of history is the outgrowth of a theme originally developed in 1938 in a presidential address to the Oxford Society of Historical Knowledge. The subject is also one on which he has frequently lectured in recent years.

The author is primarily concerned with the credentials of historicism, and more specifically with the relevance of other-worldly Christianity to the secular order. By the philosopher of history, Father D'Arcy understands the historicist, one who tries to give the meaning of the historical process, attempting the apparently impossible task of deriving from empirically observed premises, "atheological" conclusions which are beyond history's reach.

Father D'Arcy, therefore, is not primarily concerned with an Augustinian apologetic, nor in an epistemology of history as such. Although he discusses Vico in some detail, he does not attempt a systematic treatment of famous historicists in the manner of Karl Löwith.

He concerns himself first with the nature of historical knowledge, sharing to some degree the doubts of Maritain about the "scientific character of historical knowledge . . . because in contrast with science, the historian can never isolate his facts and subject them to the test of multiple experiment."

Father D'Arcy seems to share with H. J. Marrou a disdain for the romanticist's notion that the historian is called upon to reincarnate the past and renew its existence in the present; he rather sees the historian as an articulate interpreter of the past to his own generation. If this is true, as many have suggested, the value of definitive history is limited to the culture for which it is written. Each generation must have the triumph and the folly of the past explained in its own idiom and in terms of its own values.

The author proceeds with a discussion of the relation of history to historicism, seeing in the latter's mission a search for a "mythopoetic truth" which seeks a greater unity of interpretation from the lesser intelligible wholes about which most historians are agreed. Father D'Arcy then discusses Providence, considering not only the historical significance of human decisions in the light of a providential plan, but arguing effectively against the claim of Sir Isaiah Berlin that providential teleology involves determinism.

Perhaps the best chapter in the book is the one on Christianity and historicism. Father D'Arcy considers the bias developing, not among the positivists, but among Christian writers against interpretative history; he is not prepared to go as far as Karl Barth and S. S. Lewis, but does seem to share to some degree the misgivings of Butterfield, Congar, and Malevez about the possibility of final historical interpretative judgments. The author does feel that Christianity, despite the transcendent goal it assigns to history, can make two valuable contributions to a philosophy of history: cultural values are not insignificant despite the invidious comparisons sometimes made between the natural and the supernatural; secondly, there is an outstanding importance of each human person "with the consequent dramatic, and cosmic quality of his choices."

The book has a richness of material and a felicity of expression that cannot be indicated adequately in a summary review of its contents. The sole disappointment this reviewer experienced was the scarcity of treatment on cyclicism.

ROBERT PAUL MOHAN, S.S.

CHILDREN'S SHEPHERD. THE STORY OF JOHN CHRISTOPHER DRUMGOOLE. By Katherine Burton. New York: P. J. Kenedy and Sons, 1954. Pp. viii + 236. $3.75.

Katherine Burton has a unique capacity for taking fascinating characters as subjects for her biographical studies. Father Drumgoole landed in New York as an Irish immigrant in 1824, and grew

with the city. Early Catholic life there is well described in this book. At the age of fifty-three he was ordained to the priesthood; and his special apostolate became New York's thousands of homeless and neglected children. The system of training he developed (and his historic founding of the famous institute for homeless children, Mount Loretto in Staten Island) caused Cardinal Spellman to write of him in the book's Foreword, "There is probably no other man in our country's history to whom we are more indebted for originating and developing our present system for the care and education of homeless, destitute, orphaned boys and girls . . ." (p. vii). The Cardinal's own novel *The Foundling* was, he says in the Foreword, inspired by Mount Loretto.

At Father Drumgoole's death (of pneumonia as a result of exposure in the blizzard of '88) a letter of condolence was sent from his Italian contemporary and counterpart, Don Bosco. Other letters of sorrow arrived from both Father Damien of Molokai and Leo XIII—no small tribute!

The author's account, almost necessarily novelized because of lack of many details, is nonetheless filled with all the known facts and figures. The book also has a substantial bibliography and index. *Children's Shepherd* can be recommended to priests in the apostolate as a sample of what one man could and did so.

And it can be recommended highly for all priests interested in tracing the results of apostolic love in the heart of one of their dedicated brethren.

DONALD F. X. CONNOLLY, C.S.P.

SERAPH AMONG ANGELS. By Sister Mary Minima, Carmelite. Translated by The Very Reverend Gabriel N. Pausback, O. Carm. Illinois: The Carmelite Press, 1958. Pp. xviii + 363. $3.95.

Mysticism is something for which we are not conditioned. To twentieth century readers, therefore, the life of Saint Mary Magdalene de'Pazzi will appear, at best, unusual. For the modern hagiographer of a mystic faces a problem: whether to present facts selectively enough to make the mystical and ecstatic fare palatable, or simply plunge deep into the mystical waters and face the consequences of a small readership. *Seraph Among Angels,* well documented, adequately written, and pleasantly translated though it is, plunges!

Seraph recounts the story of the little Italian girl who at age nine was quite comfortable in the realms of meditation. By age twelve, the mystical ring of perpetual virginity already on her finger, she

boarded the train of ecstasies that lasted until her death at the age of forty-one.

With her entrance into Mount Carmel, the sixteen-year-old ecstatic grew progressively aware that she was given an earthly life to repair the human tragedy: "God is not loved." To steep her in her reparatory resolve, Christ granted the young woman visions of creation's destiny: the nightmares of hell, the dreams of heaven. *Seraph* spends time on the alternate anguish and joy that the supernatural insight produced.

The few times that the story goes human on us, Saint Mary Magdalene de'Piazzi comes off less seraphic, but far more imitable. She knew, and conquered, impatience and beckonings to impurity. Her reactions at times—she fasts intensively despite serious illness, she makes a bed of thorns to slice her tempted flesh—are less imitable. But, as Father Pausback explains in the foreword, "a life as lofty as that of St. Mary Magdalene de'Pazzi is not to be judged by average standards." That the Saint was zealous is manifest in her correspondence with hierarchy from the Pope down; that she was tender is clear from her dealings with Marie de'Medici of France; that she was capable, in her tenures as Mistress of Novices and Sub-Prioress.

The sum total of the book: a non-scientific documentary of an ecstatic life. If the biography is extreme, the life was extreme. For the climber who wonders what the heights are like, *Seraph* is adequate.

THOMAS F. SHELLEY, C.S.P.

THE RELIGION OF ISRAEL. By Albert Gélin, P.S.S. Translated by J. R. Foster. New York: Hawthorne, 1959. Pp. 111. $2.95.

SAINT PAUL AND HIS MESSAGE. By Amédée Brunot, S.C.J. Translated by Ronald Matthews. New York: Hawthorne, 1959. Pp. 140. $2.95.

These two books, contributions happily contained in the generally excellent series known as *The Twentieth Century Encyclopedia of Catholicism,* are natural complements one to the other. St. Paul has described the Old Testament as the pedagogue unto Christ. Nowhere are these words more accurately and consistently true than in the Christian message enunciated by the great Apostle to the Gentiles. If one reads these works one after the other, one gets the impression of reading a continuous story. A story in which ancient hope and longing become developed and crystalized as the history of the Chosen People unfolds itself, and finally reaches fulfillment in Christ. Just as the vast energies of the sun are concentrated by a magnifying glass into one

burning knot of light; so the longing of a people is gradually specified and perfected until it finds completion and fulfillment in the Messiah.

In the first of these books, Fr. Gélin, whose name is fast becoming synonymous with Scriptural scholarship, develops the thematic message of the O.T. We must recall that Israel had a varied history: nomadic tribes gradually settled down and developed a monarchy that shown throughout the ancient East for its splendor, power and devotion. Later, after the fall of the monarchy, its People faced a series of trials, and subjugation under many masters—with one brief respite during the time of the Macabees. But throughout all this, whether following their flocks, wandering in the desert, tilling the soil, established in its own land or dispersed among the world's cities as homeless wanderers in a culture completely different from its own, this People carried a secret and a vocation that separated it from all of its surroundings. It was a Covenant People. As a result of its bilateral contract with Yahweh, pictured frequently under the symbol of a marriage union, the Jewish nation was the subject of special interest on the part of God. From its covenant character stems its moral code which assumes essentially a dialogue structure: a divine call and corresponding response on the part of the People.

The O.T. story is a rhythmic drama of selection, failure, punishment and restoration. It is the story of a People who had none of the great talents for the arts, philosophy and military power that characterized other nations of the ancient world. But rather of a People who had a "real sense of values, a gift for delicate observation, a taste for the land, a capacity for assimilation, the ability to tell a meaningful story, to dream, to be thrilled and to suffer, a sense of the past and of the continuity of experience, a desire to teach and communicate, a concern for the community and a taste for symbol and mystery" (p. 102). This is the kind of People responsible for the Books of the Bible and chosen to be the depositories of the Messianic hope. They were the product of long, gradual and painful progress in instruction. Their prayer life (cf. the Psalms), the missionary spirit and yearnings are always pointed in the direction of some future mysterious and powerful intervention of God in history.

Gélin has considered every phase of Israelitic life in terms of the covenant between Yahweh and the Jewish Nation. He presents in this short volume (only 109 pages) an excellent map which traces the many themes of the Biblical narrative, and skillfully shows their interconnection. He presents here a book which not only makes the reading of the O.T. a much richer experience; but a book which makes one want to go back and read the original story for himself. This is indeed

a wonderful service and possibly the best recommendation any book could have.

In *Saint Paul and His Message,* Fr. Brunot is no less skillful in outlining the important Pauline themes and encouraging the reader to re-read the original message as it is found in the pages of the New Testament.

When one looks at some brightly colored picture in a book, he is reminded of the process of its reproduction. If there are three colors involved, there must have been a threefold process. The page has been three times through the press, receiving successively its tints of red, yellow and blue. Three layers are superimposed one on the other. So too with the Christian Message: the O.T. story is completed in the Gospels, and finally brought to theological perfection in the writings of St. Paul. From these letters we are able to get a clear picture of the lives of the first converts to the faith, and some indication of the problems that beset their lives. Reading these letters is something like listening to one side of a telephone conversation: we can only guess what is being said on the other end of the line; but, out of these bits and pieces, we are able to build a clear picture of the early Christian world, etched by a man who knew it firsthand, not only in its historical reality but also in its theological meaning. This is precisely the contribution that Fr. Brunot makes to our understanding of the message of St. Paul. He gathers the Epistles according to themes and traces their doctrine against the historical background that gave rise to them.

It is an entirely excellent work that Fr. Brunot does throughout this short (only 140 pages) yet lively treatment. St. Paul's programme of describing the Divine Master in His intimate relation with the Father and with those who, through Him, have been adopted by God is set forth so clearly in this book that a subsequent reading of the Epistles becomes immediately a very much more fruitful experience.

MICHAEL J. CANTLEY

DIGEST OF REGULATIONS AND RUBRICS OF CATHOLIC CHURCH MUSIC. Compiled by Robert F. Hayburn. Boston: McLaughlin & Reilly, 1960. Pp. 77. $1.00.

This is a much-needed, up-to-date, efficient and orderly compendium for which Father Hayburn deserves congratulations. The booklet will be extremely useful to pastors, organists, choirmasters, seminarians and sisters.

To line up the various laws of the Church regarding sacred music is very difficult. The compiler would wish to be complete, yet he would

need a keen sense of selectivity, since many of the laws connected with music refer to very special situations and often cross into other fields of divine worship. Father Hayburn wisely decided to call his effort a *digest*. To all intents and purposes it covers very well what is needed by those who are interested in performing the correct music for divine worship in the correct manner. It is nicely divided and very practical: one can see at a glance the section in which one's problem will most likely be answered.

Father Hayburn deals with the binding force of papal legislation in his first chapter; and then, in very orderly fashion takes up the laws, rubrics and even the ideals for the organ and its use in church, the sung Mass, music at weddings and funerals, Confirmation, Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, Holy Hour and Forty Hours; then follows a good treatise on vernacular hymns, and Holy Week music, with a final chapter of advice on the construction and specifications of pipe organs and electronic organs.

The compiler is in charge of the Archdiocesan Music Commission in San Francisco and is a thoroughly accomplished musician who knows what he is talking about; he is a Fellow (F.A.G.O.) of the American Guild of Organists. Some of the materials in the booklet are reprinted from the church music regulations in force throughout the Archdiocese, but as the more recent music instructions from the Holy See appeared, it was deemed advisable to make this compendium more widely available. An excellent decision.

JOHN C. SELNER, S.S.

Books Received

DIGEST OF REGULATIONS AND RUBRICS OF CATHOLIC CHURCH MUSIC. Compiled by Robert F. Hayburn. Boston: McLaughlin and Reilly, 1960. Pp. v + 77. No price given.

THE SPIRITUAL TEACHING OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. By Jules Lebreton, S.J. Translated by James E. Whalen. Westminster, Md.: Newman, 1960. Pp. xi + 382.

ST. RITA OF CASCIA: ADVOCATE OF THE IMPOSSIBLE AND ST. DYMPHNA: PATRONESS OF MENTAL DISORDERS. Clyde, Missouri: Benedictine Convent of Perpetual Adoration, 1960. Pp. 32. 10¢.

NAVIGATIO SANCTI BRENDANI ABBATIS. Edited with Introduction and Notes by Carl Selmer. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1960. Pp. li + 132. $4.75.

FRANCISCAN APPROACH TO THEOLOGY. Washington, D. C.: Capuchin College (The Franciscan Educational Conference), 1960. Pp. ix + 353. $4.00.

SAINT AUGUSTINE ON PERSONALITY. By Paul Henry, S.J. New York: Macmillan, 1960. Pp. viii + 44. $2.25.

THE ENCOUNTER OF RELIGIONS. By Jacques-Albert Cuttat. New York: Desclee Co., Inc., 1960. Pp. 176. $3.50.

POLITICS IN THE AMERICAN DRAMA. By Caspar Nannes. Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1960. Pp. xv + 256. $4.95.

THE MYSTERY OF MARY. By R. Bernard, O.P. Translated by M. A. Bouchard. St. Louis: B. Herder Book Company, 1960. Pp. xv + 304. $4.95.

ESSAY ON THE FREEDOM OF THE WILL. By Arthur Schopenhauer. Translated by Konstantin Kolenda. New York: The Liberal Arts Press, 1960. Pp. xx + 103. Paper edition 80¢.

TO HEAVEN WITH DIANA! By Gerald Vann, O.P. New York: Pantheon Books, Inc., 1960. Pp. 160. $3.50.

A HANDBOOK OF CHRISTIAN SOCIAL ETHICS. Vol. I: Man in Society. By Eberhard Welty, O.P. New York: Herder and Herder, Inc., 1960. Pp. xvi + 395. $6.95.

THE TRUTH REQUIRED IN THE PRECES FOR RESCRIPTS. By Donald E. Adams, A.B., J.C.L. Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1960. Pp. xii + 275. $3.00.

AN INTRODUCTION TO A CATHOLIC CATECHISM. By Hubert Fischer. New York: Herder and Herder, 1960. Pp. xiv + 169. $2.50.

THE CHRISTENING PARTY. By Francis Steegmuller. New York: Farrar, Straus & Cudahy, 1960. Pp. 213. $3.75.

THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN IN PARABLES. By Franz M. Moschner. St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1960. Pp. x + 326. $4.75.

ISLAM AND THE WEST. By Norman Daniel. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, Inc., 1960. Pp. 443. $12.50.

GOLDEN TAPESTRIES. By Sister M. Gregory Kaumans. New York: Society of St. Paul, 1960. Pp. 247. $3.00.

LIFE AFTER DEATH. By Maurice Becqué, C.SS.R., and Louis Becqué, C.SS.R. Translated from the French by P. J. Hepburne-Scott. New York: Hawthorne Books. Publishers, 1960. Pp. 125. $2.95.

WHAT IS THE EUCHARIST. By Marie-Joseph Nicolas, O.P. Translated by R. F. Trevett. New York: Hawthorne Books, Publishers, 1960. Pp. 125. $2.95.

ST. AUGUSTINE IN THE PSALMS. Ancient Christian Writers 29. Translated by Dame Scholastica Hebgin and Dame Felicitas Corrigan. Westminster, Md.: Newman Press, 1960. Pp. vi + 354. $4.50.

DISPUTED QUESTIONS. By Thomas Merton. New York: Farrar, Straus and Cudahy, 1960. Pp. xii + 297. $3.95.

POLITICAL THOUGHT: MEN AND IDEAS. By John A. Abbo. Westminster Md.: Newman, 1960. Pp. xv + 452. $5.75.